

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, March, 1896.

FRANCE, FILOLOGY, FONETICISM AND POETIC FORMULAE.

I.

THERE are two perpetual proofs of French intellectual activity: the first is found in the variety and vitality of a kaleidoscopic Kalaestheticism—if we may be our own Symbolists—which is continually starting schools in poetry, the arts, and has even a share in the development of political theories highly-colored and picturesque if not always practicable; the other appears in the cry for reforms, or in the remaking and polishing of the old. Hence Paris is still the pivot of initiative in both sociological and scholastic radicalism, just as, by the curious combination of paradoxical elements in French character and political constitution, it remains the stronghold of much state and academic conservatism. The restless spirit of investigation and the habit of precision in expression, trained through centuries, has splendidly developed schools of syntactical study and the growth of scientific grammar in addition to good or bad attempts in artistic and literary experimentalism; the result is that France has definitely reached her Romantic revival, destructive and constructive, in Grammar.

Parisian centres are practical as well as prolific in their ideas, and the presence of certain similar points at issue in the English language, upon which the French status may throw light, but particularly the independent appearance in France of certain theories, the persistence of others, and the plea for wide-reaching reforms lends interest to their notice.

I.

The aphorism, then, as to "Frenchmen, that is, Grammarians" has peculiar force. The logical qualities of their mind and their language; the clearness of the medium for expressing the qualities; the subtle shading of sense and word, contribute to create for the French an interest in the study of a subject which their treatment and literary style rescue from the dryness usually inherent in

such a theme. The status of the men who have busied themselves with it assures this. Scholars and satirists, poets and philosophers, comic writers and novelists, have either hurled or brought a brick to shatter or to sustain the grammatical structure. No literature offers such a sequence in this connection as the brilliant line from Vaugelas to Voltaire; the Marots, Ménages and Malherbes, "tyran des mots et des syllabes;" Ronsard, "prince of poets," and the Pléiade; and the band of witty, caustic reformers of Rhetoric by ridiculing its extravagances: Molière, Sorel, Scarron, Saint Évremond. When we add the profound and permanent influence of the *Précieuses*, more powerful than any corresponding movement on the continent, the element well-summed up by Somaize when he says: "De tout temps il y eut des femmes d'esprit;" the serious study of the subject by men of the type of Maupertuis and Condillac; and the host of rigorous Grammarians inferior yet most important, we can better gauge the heredity in France of such a discussion, which has taken new life and new forms and increased power because based upon principles, philosophical, practical, and even pecuniary and political.

II.

Three books which present three phases of the reform cover the main points. In the *Lexique de Ronsard*¹ just published we find a much-needed defense of the poet from the charges, now classical, of his lack of patriotism for his own tongue, and his enthusiasm for external and therefore alien-to-French expressions. Limiting ourselves to two of M. Mellerio's chapters we may well see that Ronsard's rehabilitation is sufficiently complete, and that the invention of the words Ronsardize, Ronsardism, and Ronsardist need not be more of a reproach than the epithetizing characteristic of the rise of the Romantic revival.

¹ *Lexique de Ronsard*, précédé d'une étude sur son vocabulaire, son orthographe et sa syntaxe par L. Mellerio, Professeur au lycée Janson de Sailly, &c., et d'une préface par M. Petit de Julleville. Paris, E. Plon, Nourrit et Cie, 1895 (the latest (171st.) volume in the *Bibliothèque Elzévirienne*, completing the Ronsard series, vii (now viii) vols., 1857-1867). Two new Branthômes make the number 173.

If we owe much to Boileau, yet his baseless critical condemnation of Ronsard is on a par with his ignorance of pre-Villonian poetry. The persistence of this judgment has survived to this day, and it speaks much for conservative power in literature that no one has hitherto absolutely verified, or in this result, disproved Despréaux' dictum. The Bacchic hymn which gave the particular proof of the poet's literary sins was written, it seems, says his contemporary Claude Binet, by Bertrand Bergier de Montembeuf. So Ronsard's regrets at the impossibility of speaking in French, or claim that his French verses can be understood only by Greeks and Romans, mean respectively, that, as he says:² "nostre langue ne pouvait exprimer ma conception," and that knowledge of classical mythology can alone predicate appreciation of his theme. And in his words, which had already been marked by the writer for this purpose, before he became acquainted with M. Mellerio's book, we find the following theories:

1. His love of French, in the preface to the *Franciade*:³

"Je te conseille d'apprendre diligemment la langue grecque et latine, voire italienne et espagnole; puis, quand tu les sauras parfaitement, te retirer en ton enseigne comme un bon soldat, et composer en ta langue maternelle, comme a fait Homere, Hesiodé, Platon, Aristote et Theophraste, Virgile, Tite-Live, Salluste, Lucrece et mille autres, qui parloient meme langage que les laboureurs, valets et chambrières. Car c'est un crime de leze majesté d'abandonner le langage de son pays, vivant et florissant pour vouloir deterrer je ne sçay quelle cendre des anciens."

2. He wishes to incorporate dialectic forms (*Franciade*, and *Art Poétique*).

3. He counsels reviving Old French:⁴

"Tu ne rejetteras point les vieux mots de nos romans."

"De remettre en usage les antiques vocables et principalement ceux du langage wallon et picard lequel nous reste par tant de siècles, l'exemple naïf de la langue françoise;" and "choisir les mots les plus pregnans et significatifs non seulement dudit langage mais de toutes les provinces de France."⁵

He elsewhere in the *Poétique* mentions other dialects.

² Vol. vii, p. 178.

³ *Œuvres*, Vol. iii, p. 34.

⁴ *Art Poétique*, Vol. vii, p. 320.

⁵ *Franciade*.

M. Mellerio also gives the interesting passage, quoting Ronsard's "testament" in which he urges not to "écorcher le latin," nor to lose "natural French vocables" and these "old terms." On the other hand, he allows the creation of new words:⁶ "Pourveu qu'ils soient moulez et façonnez sus un patron desja receu du people."

Of Ronsard's vocabulary in his almost one hundred thousand lines, of their almost exclusive French character, of his independence, and his mistake in composing French words by Greco-Latin *imitation*, we need not speak. Interesting as the subject is, we are not, however, discussing creation of words, but criticism of existing ones, for modern grammatical reform is more occupied with present and past conditions, which, once settled, will necessarily condition the future. Leaving aside also his Syntax, his Orthography requires a few statements.

The sixteenth century, like the nineteenth, saw two schools of orthography. Rabelaisian chaos, purposely increased for both comic effect and political safeguard, had still further helped the being a law unto oneself in spelling, and the ignorance of reasons for preferences in some forms to the exclusion of others. Ramus represented phonetic reform in his *Gramère françoise*, as did Jacques Peletier in his *Dialogue de l'ortographe et prononciation françoise*, and Maigret. Authors believed, because of their learning, in etymological orthography. Ronsard, inclining to the former, ostensibly adopted the latter theory, but in reality, like all of the writers of the time, used a poetic pleasure and a license dictated by rhythmic or rhymic factors. But Ronsard's theories may well serve as a decalogue of modern criticism and a proof of the justice of modern demands, as we shall see, and a plea for return to 'old things best.' Take some usages, or rules of Ronsard, or recommendations: 1. He elides *i*, as in *ni*; and defends the same for *o* and *u* as do "the Italians, or rather the Greeks."⁷ The *i*-elision might well be restored. So elision of a final unpronounced consonant for purposes of rhyme.⁸ But though his counsels apply more particu-

⁶ *Franciade*, Vol. iii, p. 32.

⁷ Vol. vii, p. 326. ⁸ *ibid.*, p. 328.

larly to poetry, prose and euphony can profit by them as well.

So, 2, the *s* of the first singular of verbs is to be dependent upon the avoidance of hiatus;⁹ 3, superfluous etymological letters are to be suppressed;¹⁰ 4, *z* and *k* are to be restored, and to displace the duality of use of *c* and *q*; 5, the assimilation of proper names to the vernacular;¹¹ 6, actual words shall be the basis of compounds.¹²

So again, in the *Advertissement au lecteur* preceding the Odes,¹³ we find the same or other suggestions looking 7, to the dropping of etymological *y* (though retaining it as final for *i*); 8, the change of *ph* to *f*; 9, the creation of characters equivalent to the phones *ll*, *gn*, *ch*; 10, or consonantal *i* and *u* (*j* and *v*). So, also, he quite consistently puts *el'* or *ell'* for *elle*. His greatest claim seems to have been the introduction of the euphonic *t* between inverted verb and pronoun (though M. Mellerio suggests that he simply generalized popular usage which had intercalated the *t* by analogy with other conjugations; this in spite of Remy Belleau's statement as to Ronsard's invention of it). But we may sum up Ronsard's position, first by his statements; next, by his honest independence:

"Tu n'auras soucy de ce que le vulgaire dira de toy, d'autant que les Poètes, comme les plus hardis, ont les premiers forgé et composé les mots;"¹⁴

"Je supplie très-humblement ceux ausquels les muses ont inspiré leur faveur de n'estre plus latineurs ni grecaniseurs, comme ils sont plus par ostentation que par devoir, et prendre pitié, comme bons enfants, de leur pauvre mere naturelle."¹⁵

The changes are proposed, because:

"Quant à notre écriture, elle est fort vicieuse et corrompue, et me semble qu'elle a grand besoin de reformation."¹⁶

so, the Caprice, *Tout est perdu*:¹⁷

"Promecine-toy dans les plaines Attiques,
Fay nouveaux mots, r'appelle les antiques,
Voy les Romains
Lors sans viser aux jalouses atteintes
Des mal-vueillans, formes-en les douceurs
Que Melpomene inspire dans les coeurs!

9 *ibid.*, p. 333. 10 *ibid.*, p. 334. 11 *ibid.*, p. 335.

12 *ibid.*, p. 336. 13 p. 14.

14 *Art Poétique*, Vol. vii, p. 335.

15 *Franciade*, Vol. iii, p. 35. 16 *Ibid.*, p. 36.

17 *Recueil des Poemes*, Vol. vi, p. 329.

J'ay fait ainsi: toutesfois ce vulgaire,
A qui jamais je n'ay peu satisfaire,
N'y n'ay voulu, me fascha tellement
De son japper en mon advenement,
Quand je hantay les eaux de Castalie,
Que nostre langue'en est moins embellie."

And finally that fine passage of the *Poétique*,¹⁸ where the poet states his creed again when he says:

"Ne se faut soucier, comme je l'ay dit tant de fois, de l'opinion que pourroit avoir le peuple de tes escrits, tenant pour règle toute assurée qu'il vaut mieux servir à la verité qu'à l'opinion du peuple."

Ronsard's theories yielded somewhat in practice; or, as M. Mellerio, who does not seem to have included the above passages, perhaps to avoid repetition, closes his discussion of the orthography by saying:

"Qu'il y eut en lui deux hommes: l'un prônant avec ardeur une méthode qu'il jugeait très digne d'illustrer la langue, l'autre trop éclairé et trop circonspect pour la pratiquer résolument."

III.

Ronsard's position is obviously a starting-point. Back of him was only the unformed Modern French. His prominence and association with the Pléiade increase the value of his suggestions, and their statement again in this new book shows the perpetuity of his principles. To note the changes from his attempts to Voltaire, would be a study of historical grammar, or of statements as admirable as the individual themes, for instance, of Prof. Matzke,¹⁹ or the general discussion in the brilliant book of M. Vernier;²⁰ to state all present conditions would be to give a résumé of Lesaint.²¹ Accepting the language as we find and read it, we can see the sense and force of the reforms hanging in the balance in France, between Academy dilatoriness and unpermeated popular opinion, but set forth in the caustic and compelling arguments of M.

¹⁸ Vol. vii, p. 336.

¹⁹ "On the Pronunciation of French Nasal Vowels in the xvi and xvii Centuries," *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, Vol. ix, no. 3.

²⁰ *Étude sur Voltaire Grammairien et la Grammaire au xviii Siècle*, Paris, 1888.

²¹ *Traité complet de la Prononciation française dans la seconde moitié du xixè siècle*, Halle, 1890.

Renard's pamphlet.²²

The question is a vital one to France. If, as runs the political aphorism, her colonial question is the Rhine, yet in the larger expansion which is to help her,²³ *orthographic reform* plays a large part. France, whose ratio of population to the rest of Europe has decreased from 38 per 100 in the year 1700 to 13 per 100 in 1880,²⁴ now sees her idiom struggling in Belgium with Flemish, in Switzerland with German and Italian, in Luxembourg with German, in Canada with English, and in Tunis with an Italian more easily assimilated by the child because of greater orthoepic and less orthographic characteristics. And it is this which gives national as well as literary point to the petition of M. Havet, praying for Academic *imprimatur* on its reforms, and signed by the three directors of instruction (primary, secondary, and superior), by forty members of the Institute, two hundred and fifty University professors, one thousand professors of Lycées and Collèges, and thousands of male and female school-teachers, all this backed by the *Alliance française*, that propaganda in pedagogics, founded for the patriotic purpose of stimulating the study of the language in foreign parts.

We need not rehearse the arguments pro and con of the phonetic school and its opponents, and show how even in its irregularities French orthography is assimilated with phoneticism and that laws of pronunciation unconsciously take precedence over any other. The plea for phonetic treatment in large part coincides with that of its adversaries, the etymologists, in the demand for clarification and the purification from excrescent or epenthetic letters. French orthography, too, has its own historical development, clear and comparatively simple. Persistent attempt at violation of principle does not improve and only destroys etymology itself. And the mass of incongruities and inconsistencies, the false analogies and pedantic re-integrations have

²² *La Nouvelle Orthographe*, par Auguste Renard, Professeur de l'Université, etc., with preface by M. Havet, professor of the Collège de France, Paris, 1893.

²³ Cf. articles like "L'Essor extérieur de la France," *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1893, Vol. 3.

²⁴ Bertillon's tables.

obscured the facile, the natural, and the truth of linguistic law found in the earlier or middle period of the literature. Examples become too numerous to quote more than one of each under a few of the points criticized by reformers or proposed by them, and which prove the force of their attack, one free from ridiculous reformatations and graphical propositions which complicate things so much as to excite justly the "gaiety of nations," and where no volapuk vagaries hinder immediate adoption.

1. Were French purely etymological we should write *hon* for *on* (homo), *ci-jit* (*jacere*) *geaune* (*galbinus*).

2. If *phantome* has given *fantôme*, what hinders *filosofie*, *fotografie* (cf. Spanish simplicity and Italian usage); if *ferais* why not *fesais*, if *rhythme* has sunk to *rythme*, why not *rytme*.

3. So with *doigt* to be like *doi(b)t* (as *cognoistre* dropped *g* and *s*), and all parasitic, and some double letters *vin(g)t*, *t(h)éâtre*, *se(p)t*, *at(t)endre*. M. Renard in his witty piece of professorial pamphleteering has succinctly stated in a personal and condensed form the changes desired, and drawn admirable illustrations from other grammarians as well.

4. Change of letters of mixed or more than single pronunciations: *t* as *t* or as *s*; *c* as *k* or as *s*; *x* as *es* or *gz* or *z* or *k*; *il* as *ille* or *ie*.

5. Change in letters of double use, as *c, k, q*, which could be reduced to one; so *an, en, em, ean, aon* (*ancien, encore, empire, Jean, paon*), all pronounced ali'ce but spelled di'f'rent'y.

6. Abolition of the doubled *n* or *t* in feminine nouns and adjectives; for we have its exception in *-ain, -in*, sometimes *-an*.

7. Abolition of *-x* plurals.

8. Simplification of compound-noun complications and of plurals of foreign words.

9. Reduction of *-yer, -eler* and *-eter* verbs to a similar basis.

10. Obviation of dual difficulties in phrases such as:

"Ils usent d'*expédient* et *expédient* des portions qu'il faut que nous portions aux poules du couvent pour qu'elles couvent."

11. Assimilation to others of all forms of Latin *ab* or *ac* origin (*académie* and *accabler?* *apercevoir* and *apparaître?*).

M. Renard devotes some of his argument

to answering objections that these changes would distort, if not also debase, the historical heredity of the language. But tradition before the tampering of the post-Renaissance reformers is the strongest argument to back this seemingly radical treatment, as the slightest scholarship will show. If the fear of individualism—the independence of each writer—is present, the greatest literary epochs of France had it, and the public chaos or personal caprice in writing stopped in no way the march of phoneticism, as outlined in the successive prefaces of the Academy dictionaries. Paleographical charts which have recently so multiplied in France, as well as the merest study, prove this at a glance. So, also, dialectic deviations offer no danger; the clearest and most perfect pronunciation, the Parisian, open only to the charge of its *grassement*, will keep the supremacy it has had because of a capital's influence, literary superiority, and as the best medium for the clarifying of rougher exceptions in the provincial speech. But phonetic evolution has always been the law of the language, and the greater its development, the closer will be the assimilation to the classically ignorant but phonetically simple orthography of the *Roland* period. M. Renard sees the reason for this century's stagnation in an advance, in the imperial rulings which fastened upon France an official orthography, and he looks to the recoil of Republicanism in writing as in politics to alter this antiquated scheme.

If, however, the objection be taken from etymology so-called, the glaring incongruities condemn the critics of the new movement. If Latin and Greek words are to be the absolute basis of French words, then, for instance, all English words already assimilated are to be Anglicized anew,²⁵ for a consistent creed must rule in language. For if, as is the case, the sounds of foreign tongues have been Gallicized, the writing of them should also be thus modified. The inconsistency grows by the partial preservation or excision of letters (*baptême*, *ecrit(p)t*), or the interchanged use of *t* and *s* sounds; if *ch* in *écho* has a *k*-sound, why should *c* in *cant* not be pronounced *chant*?

²⁵ On this point, cf. Lesaint's statements in reference to French adoption of foreign words and their pronunciation.

And, again, etymological letters do not teach the savant the origin of words, much less, the ignorant. But the finishing point is put to a weak defense by the comparison of inconsistencies drawn from a similar source: *ph* represents the *f*-sound in *physique*, *photographie*; *fantaisie*, *frénétique*; the first phonetic elements of *théâtre*, *thème*, *trône*, *trésor*, are all from Greek *th*; so the *c*-sound in *choléra* and *colère* is given one graphic sign; so, *idylle* and *asile*; *psychologie* and *métempsychose*; *holocauste* and *olographe*. A similar huge list is found in Latin transferences, where *t=c* or *t*; *l=l* or *ll*, *qu=qu* or *c*, *au=au* or *o*, and *o* gives four different *eu*-sounds. These results have led to insertions in the French of letters not even etymological: *dom(p)ter*, *(h)uile*, *hom(m)e*, etc. And so arises the injustice of pronouncing *annexion*, *direction*, *occupation*, *passion*, alike, and teaching quadruple difficulty.

The fear of disturbance due, in education or in commerce, to the introduction of such vast changes is easily conjured by the ease of past partial attempts and the example of Spanish and Italian experiment and even German, while the new processes will be natural to a new generation, and more easily taught. And if printers and publishers, loaded with types and books, oppose the reform, the reduction of characters reducing time in composition and paper, may also reduce price, and double sales may compensate for a supposed loss. This, of course, is not merely a French, but a universal argument.

From phonetic reform will flow fixity of the language and opposition to the growing danger that pronunciation will adapt itself to orthography, instead of the latter to the former, thus ruining the facile beauty and flow of French, and bringing back the harsher elements which the early language had so properly expunged as not suited to the sound nor spirit of the language.

And all dangers will be avoided by limiting the reform by principles of the clearness of the discourse, and retaining the individuality of words, as well as homonyms whose change would lend to ambiguity (*mer*, *mère*, *maire*), or grammatical form be obscured (*cruel*, *cruelle*); those already similar (*grève*, *grève*,

bière, bière) numbering about one hundred and twenty-nine, must unfortunately remain exceptions. Final root consonants, betraying origin, are also to be retained (*ar(t)*, *cour(t)*). Thus from the hundreds of modifications proposed appear the following rules:—

1. Suppression of mute *h* after *c* or *t*.
2. Of *ph*, made into *f*.
3. Of *y*=simple *i*.
4. Of double letters where pronounced singly.
5. Each sound to be represented by a sign, letter or group.
6. Abolition of parasitic letters.
7. The same sound to be represented by the same forms.
8. Conversely, the same signs always to express the same sounds.
9. Regular feminines to add simply *e*.
10. Plurals, save proper names, to end only in *s*.
11. The simplification, or not changing as the case may be, of the rules (grammatical) of *nu*, *demi*, *vingt*, *cent*, *quelques*, *tout*, the past participles; and changes in verb-finals.

To these rules, the famous report of M. Gréard to the Academy (1893) has added others, such as the suppression of the circumflex, replacing a mute *e*, the regularising of the use of accents, of the words of different genders from the same source, of participial *-ant*, *-ent*, the suppression of the hyphen in compound nouns (generally).

But if M. Renard has stated practical theories, M. Clédat has applied their substance to immediate scholastic use in his, because of its importance, really great work,²⁶ prefaced by M. Gaston Paris. No more than M. Renard is he a ranting reformer, but the prover of sensible and scientific substitutions, based upon phonetic and philological principles capable of historical proof as to correctness, if the touchstone be the perpetual law of language and of literature, "the usage of the best writers." And two points add weight: the plea for consistency, which is the key-note of M. Clédat's own reasoning, and the fact that

²⁶ *Grammaire Raisonnée de la Langue Française* par Léon Clédat, Professeur, etc., Lauréat de l'Académie Française. Troisième édition, Paris. H. Lesoudier, 1894.

there is to be no destructive disfiguring. For M. Clédat is a Romance scholar, whose respect for the Classics and love for the founders of philosophical grammar the Greeks, will naturally be both glad to find and eager to accept, changes that combine a common ground of clear gain, *pietas* toward the past, and economic value in saved time, of immediately apparent worth. Without stopping at the brilliant preface of M. Gaston Paris, with its differentiation of the difficulties, the definitions, and the deficiencies of the present grammars and their educational use; with its interesting analysis of the past feebleness in this respect and the present possible function of the Academy; and pointing out the opposition, let us say, of the printers and publishers who see only the immediate danger to their vested interests; or of business, stagnant in part during transition from the old to the new system; or of sacrifice of books already published, and with it the necessity for recasting every dictionary, M. Paris also protests forcibly against the preponderance given to orthography in grammatical study. He calls "national orthography in reality one of the forms of public life." He advocates the calling of a congress of linguists, pedagogues, business men and printers instead of poets and writers or even philosophers and critics, to formulate an orthography, as simple and useful as the metric system decreed by the Convention. And he then closes with a tribute to M. Clédat's work as a precursor of rational instruction and a release from the intolerable burden of incorrect rule, moribund tradition, false analogy and the orthographic vagaries whose violation often ruins the career of an applicant for place, or whose memorized use, through long years of dry exercise, stamp the social status.

The analysis of M. Clédat's book, owing to the latter's clearness, is easy. We may leave aside the Phonetics, the more so as we have such skillful expounders of historical or modern phases in our country as Professors Rambeau and Matzke. M. Clédat proposes what is after all, a normal, safe and sensible theory. The perpetual appeal to the great writers, the French Classicists as models of style, has little worth if we are to accuse them of ignorance

of the fundamentals in the form of words. Unlettered litterateurs are a paradox, an anomaly, and fortunately an exception. Yet Restif de la Bretonne's chaotic and eccentric genius is indisputable in spite of his spelling. The sixteenth century never pretended to learn grammar. Yet, as M. Gaston Paris says, the best authors of the language lived at this time, and as Courier said, those "femmelettes" of the time of Louis XIV wrote better than the most skillful of our own day, and had never learned a word of French grammar any more than had their illustrious cotemporaries. That La Bruyère and La Fontaine, that Vaugelas and Voltaire, that Ronsard and Racine, that Bossuet and Fénelon, that Pascal and Corneille, that Montaigne and Montesquieu, and Madame de Sévigné as the representative of the brilliant band of women of letters in French literature, should be false standards is a contradiction in terms. Also, M. Clédât throughout his whole book aids his cause by constant references to their simpler notations which Voltaire introduced in his edition of Corneille in 1764, and which are at this late day, no more illogical nor terrifying than the stock examples of Spanish or Italian *filosofa*, *filologia* et mult al. "unnature," as the French say, are the original source, the crystalized philological history, or destroy the utility of the words themselves. But he emphatically states that his reforms are based on reason, not authorities.

We are promised shortly by two American professors, a French grammar, whose outline is based upon principles similar to those expounded by M. Clédât. To sum up some of his main propositions, lack of space forbidding us to give the reasons for them or the list of analogies, we have:—

1. Elision of mute *h* in *bonheur*, *heureux*, etc., by analogy with old French, *l'erbe*, *l'iver*, and modern *on* (*hon*), *avoir* (*havoir*), etc.
2. Suppression of *e* mute after a vowel in the interior of words, *jourai*, *j'oublierai*.
3. Suppression of other mute vowels, as *pan* (*paon*), *out* (*aout*), with appeal to the classical authors.
4. Substitution of *s* for *x* final mute or pronounced *s*, and for *z* in second persons plural.

5. Consistent simplification of final consonants, (*pie*)*d*, (*noeu*)*d*, *ni*(*d*), like *nu*, etc.; *sein*(*g*), *poin*(*g*) like *malin*, *témoin*, and restoration of final *t* in all third singular indicatives.

6. Elimination of dual spellings like *différent*, *différend*, *conter*, *compter*; of mute non-final consonants. Why *cor*(*p*)*s*, if we have *corset*, *corsage*; if *sept*, *Septembre*, then why not *recepvoir*, *debvoir*, *hôte*? So, *le*(*g*)*s*, *doi*(*g*)*t*, *vin*(*g*)*t*, since we have *di*(*c*)*t*, *au*(*l*)*tre*, etc.

To the objection of confusion: it is impossible to confuse *le lis* and *tu lis*, or *dis* (*dix*) and *tu dis*, or *pois* (*poids*) and *pois*, or *puis* (*puits*) with *puis*. The context saves the situation.

7. No mute consonants before *s*: *enfants*, *lons*, and in verbs, *prends*, like *sens*, *peins*.

8. Open *è* to be always accented, and to be followed by a single consonant when only one consonant is pronounced: *querèle*, and in corresponding forms of *-eler* verbs. Similarly *imbécilité*, *batre*, *chate*, like *imbécile*, *abatis*, *rate*. The usage in classical writers is here again a powerful argument.

9. Nasal vowels to be always written with *n*, never with *m*.

10. Nasal *a* to be *an*: *couvant* (*couvent*), *expédiant*; and so, in all present participles, and, as in the classics, *vanger* (cf. *revanche*), *paranthèse*, *comancer*, *tandresse*, and adverbs in *-mant*.

11. Nasal *e* should strictly be as in *plén* for *plein*.

12. If we have *printanier* with *printemps*, therefore, and as in old pronunciation: *fame*, *couane*, *ardament*.

13. Forms like *ême* (*aime*), *émé* (*aimé*), *ésophage*, like *économique*, etc.

14. Change of *y* to *i* in words of Greek origin: *analyse*, *stile*, *pyramide*, etc.; *y* to equal only two *i*'s, or semi-vowel *i*, forming diphthong. The last, as best, gives *craiyon*, *ryen*, etc.

15. The sound *eu* to be everywhere written *oe*, to avoid such discrepancies as *cueillir*, *oeuf*, *neuf*, *oeil*; or *oe* after *c* or *g*, and elsewhere *eu*.

16. *Au* to equal *o*: *orculaire* as *oreille*; *eau* to become at least *au*; (So (Voltaire)

château, potau); *o* for *um*, as *albom* (cf. *mon* from *meum*), for we have *circonstance* (*cum*) and others.

17. Loss of every *h* after *r* or *t*, *théâtre*, like *trône*; Italian or Spanish analogy indicates the law.

18. *ch* to equal the soft, *c* (and *k* before *e*, *i*) the hard sound. Thus, the avoidance of *x* transliterated into *qu*, *k*, or *c*, as in *ἄσχειν*, to give *exarchat*, *monarchie*, *monarque*, *patriarcal*, with consequent confusion. Therefore, like Voltaire, *crétien*, *cristianisme*, or with Victor Cousin, *psychologie*.

19. *ph* to be *f*. If we have *fantastique*, *fiole*, *faisan*, *et mult. al.*, then *philosofie*, *frénologie*, etc.

20. *k* to replace hard *c* and *qu*, as Ronsard desired. Its universal consistency of sound in European alphabets aids the change. The anomalies here are too numerous to be indicated. M. Clédat here proposes *k* or *q*-simple (without *u*) for the hard *c*. And the addition of *u* or *w* to mark a pronunciation of the type *équateur*, *équestre*. (We might add that this suggests a wise introduction of the letter *w*. There is no real reason for French antipathy to it, as foreign or harsh, though perhaps due to the association with the series *wh* -*o*, -*at*, -*y* -*ere*, always hateful by its aspiration and English character.)

21. *g* soft to be *j*; hard, to remain *g*; so *najer* (*navigare*) like *joie* (*gaudia*).

22. *s* to be always harsh *s*; *s* between vowels to become, as pronounced, *z*; this would abolish the anomaly of four Latin terminations which were pronounced differently (-*tionem*, -*cionem*, -*sionem*, -*ssionem*) and all became French *sion*, being written in four different ways; and reduce to *s* the sound written *s*, or *ss*, or *sc*, or *c*, or *t*, according to their Latin origins (so, *hazarder*, *mazure*, *roze*, *dizième* (since, *dizaine*), etc.). But final *s* linked, to remain *s*.

23. *v* where pronounced *v*; *wagon*, not *wagon*.

24. Liquid *l* to be *y*.

25. Suppression of *i* unpronounced before *gn*; *ognon*, *pognard*.

26. *ks* to be *x*, or *ks* or *cs* (*tocsin*). But *gz* for that sound of *x*, (*egzil*, *egzamen*).

27. (a) Suppression of unnecessary diæreses;

(b) of superfluous accents (*ça*, *delà*, *déjà*); (c) of circumflexes in preterites, and imperfect subjunctives; (d) abolition of anomalous duals like *mélange*, but *il mêle*; *conique*, but *cône*, *coteau*, *côte*, *extrémité*, *extrême*; (e) the completion of Academic ruling by extension of the principle of *collège* to other *e*-words, and the writing of futures and conditionals similarly (*cèderai*); (f) introduction of the apostrophe, written as well as pronounced, in the class of words like *quoique*, *puisque*, *lorsque*; (g) its elision in *d'avance*, *d'abord*, etc., since we find *davantage* and *dorénavant*; (h) the writing *presquille*, *quelcun* (like *chacun*), and *grand mère*, *grand route*, etc.

28. (a) Words compounded with a prepositional prefix or adverb to drop the hyphen: (b) words beginning with the indicative present of verbs to drop hyphens, (*portemonnaie*, *essuimain*, etc.). This will also remove in the singular the *s*-plural of the second word, *couvre pied(s)*; (c) the rule to be extended to cover the type *boutentrain* (cf. *justaucorps*), *meurdefaim* (cf. *vaurien*); (d) hyphen-suppression in adjective+substantive compounds, pronouns (*lui même*), in two words linked by prepositions, (*arc-en-ciel*), but (*arc de triomphe*); (*gris-de-fer*), but (*bleu de ciel*), etc., in compounds of two nouns or adjectives (*wagon lit*). But if the adjectives have independent values, as in *sourd(et) muet*, hyphen; if dependent (*nouveau-né*), omit the hyphen. But even here, great difficulties arise and complete omission is recommended save in words of the type: *Gallo-Romains*, *Franco-Russe*, etc., (e) as in elliptical expressions, such as *coq à l'ane*, *hautlecorps*, and compounds of *ci* and *là*, and in verbs before personal pronouns without epenthetic *t*; *donne moi*, *voulez vous*, but *arrive-t-il*? (f) omission, as well, in prepositional and adverbial phrases, and in numbers. Hente, in all cases save elliptical expressions, either juxtaposition or soldering, according to the preponderance already existing in each class. Writers employing new words in philosophy or in science to have freedom of using hyphen or of not using it.

The second part of M. Clédat's book discusses Flexions and Syntax, the latter here linked to Morphology. The reforms he has here proposed touch rather the manner and

the matter of French grammatical instruction than phoneticism. But the question of forms recurs, as in those of the Article. The value of the older usages, as both phonetic and more logical, is made apparent. Many things might be noted: the suppression of the superfluous (as is proved) partitive, after simplification of the definite. But this learned set of propositions, by going back to archaic forms, is merely anticipating the power of popular speech which is to be as leveling, that is consistent, in the logic of grammar, as it is in insisting upon the simpler processes of word-production (for example, new verbs are put in the first conjugation). This unity in the evolution of language is a pleasing linguistic proof that right will prevail here as in other spheres. And the very hindrances to it are an emphatic proof of what the student (at least) doubts at first in the case of French acquisition—the minutiously difficult phases of French grammatical study. M. Clédat shows constantly how little we analyze the real logic of grammar, how the seemingly impregnable buttresses of the logico-grammatical fortress lack foundation and are really weak structures; and how the combined good-sense and genius of the great authors successfully and with unconscious philosophy, violated rules of literary periods before and after their own.

As constituted at present, intricacies go hand in hand with anomalies and, worse, illogicalness, which a few changes would sweep into consistent classes, and with others would disappear the laws of exceptions and counter-exceptions which make French, the language of clearness, yet a puzzle for precision.

Among other things, the author establishes: 1, the impossibility of fixing rules as to the use of capitals (a growing freedom in this respect is to be noted in France); 2, that foreign names should take French and not their own plurals, while Italian plurals in *i* should change to *s*, (*dilettantes*, *sopranos*), save when already plural in the French singular (*lazzis*, *conçettis*); 3, compound words to take *s* at the end, and proper names similarly; 4, freedom in use of singular or plural complements (*des habits d'enfants* or *d'enfant*); 5, all the names

of letters to be masculine, instead of mixed as at present; 6, nouns of double gender to be simplified, and *demi*, *nu*, *feu*, to agree (a historical position) before as well as after their nouns, instead of being ruled by the later growth of hampering laws; and colors used adjectively to agree uniformly.

7. *Vingt*, *cent*, *mille*, to take plurals in violation of the present rule; *même* to drop the plural, save in *le même*, etc.

8. (a) Changes like *c'est eux*, (b) the introduction of two new tenses in the conjugation, (c) the better use of dual auxiliaries (*avoir* and *être*) with certain verbs, (d) and phonetic simplifications, philological, and of verb-types like *prennent* into *prèn-ent* (so, *tiennent*), (e) substitutions of *s* for *x* in the type *veux* (cf. *meus*, *bous*), (f) excision of pseudo-*s* and intercalated *ds* (in *-dre*-verbs) in first singulars, and (g) change of correct *t* for *d* in third singulars (*vaint* not *vainc*, or even, as Bossuet, *il ront*, (*rompt*)).

9. Reforms like *dissout*, not *dissous*, in view of feminine *dissoute*, and removing the circumflex from *mouvoir*, whose compounds lack it.

10. Regulation of the irregularities of past participial agreement, reflexive verbs, and invariable words, including negatives.²⁷

A. GUYOT CAMERON.

Yale University.

ON THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE ANGLO-SAXON POEM *Phoenix*.¹

LITTLE has been said of late about the Cynewulfian question, but the reason is not by any means that it has been regarded as settled. On the contrary, scarcely anything has been definitely settled; and it would seem as if much of the ground might have to be gone over again. The *Phoenix*, *Guðlac*, and *Andreas* are still ranked by many among the works of Cynewulf. In some of the more re-

²⁷ It must be noted that these categories, while apparently belonging to syntactical theory are often phonetic matters, the laws of participles, as can be proved, being often dependent upon pronunciation as guides to present correctness.

¹ In part from an unpublished dissertation on the same subject submitted to the Harvard Faculty of Arts and Sciences for the degree of Ph. D.

cent discussions, indeed—those of Cremer² and Mather³—*Guðlac* and the *Phœnix* have been decidedly, the *Andreas* hesitatingly, rejected; but this almost wholly on metrical grounds. Metrical tests, however, are somewhat uncertain, and particularly so in the present state of opinion with regard to Anglo-Saxon metre. No complete refutation of the arguments of Ramhorst,⁴ Lefèvre,⁵ or Gaebler⁶ has yet been made; and until this has been done, metrical tests alone, even at best, have hardly the right to be called conclusive.

Of the three poems above mentioned, the *Phœnix* is, perhaps, the one least likely to have been written by Cynewulf. Here then it will be easiest to attack the position of those who believe in a Cynewulfian authorship for all three. In this paper, accordingly, I propose, first, to subject Gaebler's arguments for a Cynewulfian authorship of the *Phœnix* to as searching a criticism as possible within the short space at my disposal, and, secondly, to place succinctly together the arguments that make against his theory. It is hoped that the result will be a conclusion in the matter that may fairly be called definite.

Gaebler's chief arguments fall under three heads: Vocabulary, Characteristic Phrases, and Parallel Passages.

VOCABULARY.

The argument from vocabulary is, of course, an important one. Its weight, however, depends very much upon circumstances. In the first place, we must remember that the total number of words used by a writer is by no means an exact measure of the number of words known to him. It is inconceivable that any author, no matter how much he may have written, should have even nearly ex-

hausted his vocabulary; and in the case of an Anglo-Saxon poet, who has to write under the restrictions of pretty severe metrical laws, this is particularly true. That an Anglo-Saxon poet does not use a given word in a given case, therefore, does not at all mean that the word was unknown to him. In the second place, we must remember, in dealing with Anglo-Saxon works, that a great part, we cannot even guess how great a part, of the Anglo-Saxon literature that must once have existed has perished. That many of the words now classed as "rare" would cease to be classed as such, if all that had ever been written in the Anglo-Saxon tongue had come down to us, scarcely admits of a doubt. Too much weight, therefore, ought not to be given to words which are simply rare, but in no other way remarkable.

These considerations are so natural and so obvious that it may seem unnecessary even to mention them. But however generally they may be admitted in theory, they are constantly lost sight of in practice. The argument from vocabulary, in short, must be used with extreme caution. The one great fallacy into which it is apt to lead the unwary reasoner is, that striking agreement in vocabulary between two works necessarily implies identity of authorship. It need imply no such thing. Three explanations of the fact are possible: it may be due (1) simply to accident; (2) to identity of authorship; (3) to imitation. In each and every case these three possible explanations have to be considered.

Let us examine now Gaebler's⁷ list of words found only in the *Phœnix* and in Cynewulf's works.⁸ Under the category of "simplicia," we find the following: *æppled*, Ph. 506, El. 1260, Jul. 688; *bedeglian*, Ph. 98, Guð. 1226 (not found in C. W. at all); *bibyrgan*, Ph. 286, Cr. 1159 (Cf. Bl. Hom. [M] 23, 14;

² M. Cremer: *Metrische und sprachliche Untersuchung der altenglischen Gedichte Andreas, Guðlac, Phoenix*. Bonn, 1888.

³ F. T. Mather: "The Cynewulf Question from a Metrical Point of View." *MOD. LANG. NOTES*, vii, 97 f.

⁴ F. Ramhorst: *Das altenglische Gedicht vom heiligen Andreas*. Leipzig, 1886.

⁵ P. Lefèvre: "Das altenglische Gedicht vom heiligen Guðlac." *Anglia*, vi, 181 f.

⁶ H. Gaebler: "Ueber die Autorschaft des angelsächsischen Gedichtes vom Phœnix." *Anglia*, iii, 488 f. (Separately published, Halle, 1880).

⁷ Cf. Gaebler, p. 20.

⁸ Cynewulf's works (C. W.) are *Crist*, *Juliana*, *Elene*, and the "Napier Fragment." Sarrazin (*Anglia*, xii, 375 f.) and Trautmann (*Anglia*, Beiblatt, vi, 17 f.) contend that the "Fragment" belongs to *Fata Apostolorum*, and that the whole is the conclusion of the *Andreas*. There are so many difficulties in the way of this supposition, however, that the safest way is to reject it. (Cf. W. Iker, *Berichte der Königlich-Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, 1888; Sievers, *Anglia*, xiii, 22).

137, 27; 155, 7); *bisorgian*, Ph. 368, Cr. 1556 (cf. Bl. Hom. 171, 18); *dryre*, Ph. 16, Guð. 802 (not found in C. W.); *dwæscan*, Ph. 456, Cr. 486, Rid. 81³³ (common enough in compounds); *fnæst*, Ph. 15, Jul. 588 (cf. *Leechdoms* [C] iii, 100, 13); *gefær*, Ph. 426, El. 68 (cf. [Ps.] [Sp.] 104, 36); *gefylgan*, Ph. 347, El. 576 (cf. *Lind. Matth.* (Sk.) 4.20, *John*, 18, 15); *glæs*, Ph. 300, Cr. 1283 (cf. *Wright-Wülker Glossaries*, 619, 41; 756, 9); *hlinc*, Ph. 25, Rid. 4²⁴ (not found in C.W.); *onsyn*, Ph. 55, 398, Cr. 480, Guð. 800 (cf. Ps. 142, 6); *wrence*, Ph. 133, Rid. 9² (not found in C.W.); *unbryce*, Ph. 642, Jul. 235 (cf. *bryce*, Ps. 119, 5).

Of the fourteen words cited, we have thus no more than three left which are found only in the *Phænix* and in C.W., but of these three *æppled* is the only one that can be regarded as peculiar, and it occurs but twice in C.W.

"Composita"⁹ found only in the *Phænix* and in C.W.: *æðeltungol*, Ph. 290, Guð. 1288 (not found in C.W.); *deaðdennu*, Ph. 416, Cr. 244 (an ordinary compound, cf. *deaðdæg*, *deaðsele*, etc.); *ealdcyððu*, Ph. 351, 435, Cr. 738 (cf. *ealdgecynd*, *feorcyð*, etc.); *fyrbað*, Ph. 437, Cr. 831, El. 949 (by no means a peculiar compound, cf. *fyrbend*); *græswong*, Ph. 78, Jul. 6 (cf. *græsmolde*, *stanwong*, etc.); *laðgeniðla*, Ph. 50, Jul. 232 (cf. *ealdgeniðla*, *mangeniðla*, etc.); *ligbryne*, Ph. 577, Cr. 1002 (cf. *ligfyr*, *færbyrne*, etc.); *moldgræf*, Ph. 524, Jul. 690 (cf. *moldærn*, *foldgræf*, etc.); *sarwacu*, Ph. 54, 382, Jul. 527 (cf. *sarspel*, *nīðwacu*, etc.); *scyldwircende*, Ph. 502, Cr. 1487, Jul. 445, El. 762 (cf. *synwircende*, etc.); *sidweg*, Ph. 337, El. 282 (cf. *sidland*, etc.); *sindream*, Ph. 385, El. 741, Guð. 811 (cf. *sin-frea*, *sinniht*, *seledream*, etc.); *sundplega*, Ph. 111, Guð. 1308 (not in C.W.); *tirmeahtig*, Ph. 175, Cr. 1166 (cf. *tireadig*, *swiðmeahtig*, etc.).

There is nothing, we see, peculiar about any of the words here cited; they are all ordinary compounds, made up out of common elements, and would excite no remark wherever found. Moreover, only two of them occur in C.W. more than once, which certainly does not indicate any great fondness for them.

As to Gaebler's lists¹⁰ of words found in the

⁹ Cf. Gaebler, p. 24.

¹⁰ Cf. Gaebler, pp. 20 and 24.

Phænix and in C.W., but rarely elsewhere, little need be said. Equally long lists could doubtless be made out for the *Phænix* and any other body of Anglo-Saxon poetry of the same extent as C.W., and would be worth just as much. I will cite half a dozen and let the reader judge if it would be worth while to cite any more:

Afysan, Ph. 274, 657, Guð. 911, Cr. 986, By. 3, Hy. 4, 87, Vision, 125; *anhaga*, Ph. 87, 346, Guð. 970, El. 604, Rid. 6,¹¹ Hy. 4, 88, Wand. 1, B. 2368, An. 1353; *onælan*, Ph. 216, 503, Jul. 372, 580, El. 951, Guð. 928, Sal. 42, Sat. 40, Gen. 2922, etc.; *burhstede*, Ph. 284, Cr. 812, Guð. 1291, Gen. 1602, Dan. 47, B. 2265, Sat. 363, An. 581, Ruin, 2; *gleawmod*, Ph. 571, Guð. 975, An. 1581, Dan. 440; *hidercyme*, Ph. 421, Cr. 142, 367, 587, An. 1318; *sigor-fæst*, Ph. 282, Guð. 938, 1218, Vision, 150!

Out of all the words cited by Gaebler, very few occur in C.W. more than three or four times. Of these *wuldorcynning*, for example, occurs in *Satan* four times, in C.W. seven times; that is to say, proportionally about three times as often in the *Satan* as in C.W.!

To sum up, Gaebler's argument from vocabulary amounts to about this: there are in the *Phænix* some one hundred and sixty words¹¹ which do not occur in C.W.; fifteen of which occur only in the *Phænix* and in C.W.; and a goodly number—I have not thought it worth while to count them—which are found not only in the *Phænix*, and in C.W., but in the various other A.-S. poems as well. Does this warrant the conclusion that there exists between the *Phænix* and C.W.

"eine grosse verwandtschaft, die kaum anders als durch die annahme desselben verfassers erklärt werden kann?"¹²

CHARACTERISTIC PHRASES.

Characteristic phrases, or mannerisms, are without doubt valuable bits of evidence in cases of disputed authorship. The difficulty presents itself, however, what shall, and what shall not, be called a characteristic phrase? So many phrases have been cited as characteristic of Cynewulf's style that we have to

¹¹ Cf. Gaebler, pp. 19-20, 22-23.

¹² Cf. Gaebler, p. 25.

be somewhat cautious in accepting them without scrutiny. The following will perhaps serve as useful tests of a characteristic phrase: (1) it must be markedly preferred by our author; (2) it must not be used, or at least rarely, by any other writer; (3) there must be something peculiar and individual about it.

Let us examine now Gaebler's list:¹³ *in (on) + demonstrative + adjective + tid*, occurs in C. W., according to Gaebler, twenty-four times, exclusive of the *Phœnix*, eleven times. But when we make the necessary corrections, we find that the phrase in question occurs in C.W. sixteen times, in the *Phœnix* four times, and elsewhere, according to Grein nineteen times. It is worth noting that this phrase is mostly used with reference to the Last Judgment, and that most of the examples cited for C.W. are from the *Crist*, where there are particular reasons for its use. Compare, moreover, the following: *on þas frencan (halgan, etc.) tid*, Dom. (L) 214, Bl. Hom. 39, 1; 123, 12; 117, 2; 119, 14; 83, 10; 83, 27; 91, 19; 123, 32. For similar phrases, cf. *on þam miclan (mæran, etc.) dæge*, Cr. 1051, Jul. 720, B. and S. 50, 88, 149, An. 1438, Dom. 104, etc.

All these phrases, as Deering¹⁴ remarks, may be regarded as variations of familiar biblical expressions. Compare for example, *Dies tenebrarum et caliginis, dies nubis et turbinis*, Vulgate, Joel, ii, 2; compare also Vulgate, Soph. i, 15, Jer. xxx, 7, Actus ii, 20, etc.

Londes (foldan, etc.) frætwe, occurs in the *Phœnix* three times, in C.W. twice. (Cf. Men. 207, Pa. 48, Ps. 101, 22); *sigora soðcyn-ing*, Ph. twice, C.W. twice (a purely alliterative formula; cf. B. 3056, Gen. 1797, Wund. of Cr. 67); *fyra (ælda) cyn*, Ph. four times, C.W. five times (cf. An. 590, Guð. 727, 793, 836, 948, 961, 1224, Wund. of Cr. 14, Gnom. 194, Wh. 39; cf. also *ælda bearn*, Seaf. 77, Wund. of Cr. 99, Gen. 2470, Dan. 106, B. 70, 150, Men. 175, [Völuspa 23, Hel., 762, etc.]; Compare also *fira bearn*, Jud. 24, 33 [Hel. 9, etc.]; and for similar phrases compare B. 1058, Guð. 1177, Wh. 40, An. 909, Ps. 91, 1, etc.); *meahla*

¹³ Cf. Gaebler, p. 25.

¹⁴ Deering: *Poets of the Judgment Day*. Halle, 1890. p. 8.

sped, Ph. once, C.W. six times (cf. Gen. 1696, Dan. 335, Met. 4, 9; cf. also Gen. 3, Met. 20, 225, Gen. 1084, 1957, Sat. 623, 668); *brego engla*, Ph. twice, C.W. twice (cf. Gen. 181, 976, 1008, 2583, 2764, Edgar 56); *fore godes egesan*, Ph. once, C.W. twice (cf. Seaf. 101; compare also Gen. 2590, Bl. Hom. 185, 20; a common biblical phrase; cf. Vulg. ii Cor. v, 11); *æþplede gold*, Ph. once, C.W. twice, (somewhat peculiar, but too seldom used to be classed as a mannerism); *bæles (laðes, etc.) cyme*, Ph. five times, C.W. eight times (cf. Guð. 802, 945; there is not the slightest peculiarity in the phrase, genitive + *cyme*; compare *Cristes (drihtnes, etc.) cyme*, Bl. Hom. 81, 15, etc., B. and S. 162, Ex. 179, An. 660; compare also the common biblical phrases, *adventum Domini*, etc., Vulg. i Thess. iv, 14; ii Pet. iii, 12, etc.); *fus + genitive*, Ph. once, C.W. once (certainly not a favorite expression with Cynewulf; cf. Guð. 1050, 1349, Rid. 313); *blissum hremig*, Ph. twice, C.W. once (cf. Guð. 1079, An. 1701; cf. also B. 124); *clæne and gecorene*, Ph. once, C.W. twice (cf. Ps. 104, 38; 107, 5); *leohte geleafan*, Ph. once, C.W. twice (cf. Guð. 1083, Ap. 66, Dan. 643); *æfre to ealdre*, and similar phrases, Ph. four times, C.W. four times (cf. Guð. 1202, Gen. 820, Men. 153, B. 955, Ex. 424, Jud. 120, Sat. 362, etc.); one of the commonest alliterative phrases, especially in the religious poetry, where it has doubtless been influenced by such expressions as *ab æterno usque in æternum*, Vulg. i Paral. xvi, 36, *in sæculum sæculi*, ii Cor. ix, 9, etc.); *wundrum + adjective (or participle)*, Ph. six times, C.W. twice (cf. Rid. 361, Dan. 111, B. 2687, Wand. 98, Wund. of Cr. 61, Pa. 19, Met. 29, 17; a very common expression and one which survived until Chaucer's day; compare *wonder londe*, *Book of the Duchesse*, 344); *sið behealdan*, Ph. twice, C.W. once (not remarkable; for *behealdan* in the sense of *videre*, compare Gen. 107, Vision 11, 64); *lof singan*, Ph. three times, C.W. once (a mere commonplace; cf. Men. 93, Ps. 106, 31); *helpe befremman*, Ph. once, C.W. four times, (cf. B. 551, 1552, An. 91, 426, 1616, Wand. 16; cf. also B. 177, 2674, Dan. 233, Gen. 1587); *onælan + ad*, Ph. once, C.W. twice, (cf. Gen. 2922, Guð. 640); *frætwum blican*, Ph. once, C.W. three times (cf. Pa. 29); *beald reordade*, Ph. once,

C.W. once (cf. Guð. 998, An. 602); *swinsian* and *singan*, Ph. twice, C.W. once (cf. Rid. 87, Ps. 143, 10); *gewritum cyðan*, Ph. three times, C.W. twice (cf. Pa. 14; Ps. 86, 5, Rid. 40¹, Eadgar 14); genitive+superlative (remark on this "stileigentümlichkeit" is scarcely necessary; it is one of the commonest phrases in A.-S. Poetry; cf. B. 453, 454, 1120, etc., Gen. 297, 364, etc.)

These, now, together with a few so trivial that I have not thought it worth while to mention them (*eorðan turf*, *wuldres byrig*, etc.), are the phrases which Gaebler regards as "characteristic" of Cynewulf's style. Our examination shows that only two or three of them are confined to the *Phoenix* and C.W., and of these one only—*applede gold*—can by any possibility be regarded as a "characteristic" phrase, and it moreover occurs so seldom that no special importance can be attached to it.

PARALLEL PASSAGES.

In the use of this argument also, the greatest degree of caution is necessary. We must be sure we are dealing with real parallelisms. Hence all set phrases, alliterative or idiomatic, and all commonplace expressions must be excluded. But that is not all. Even when we have to do with real parallelisms, there is the possibility of imitation, or plagiarism, to be considered. Strangely enough, this possibility is almost always practically lost sight of. But since everybody knows that borrowing came quite easy and natural to writers of the Middle Ages, the fact should be taken into practical account.

¹⁵ To examine, now, Gaebler's list of parallel passages.¹⁵

- (1) *leomu lic somod and lifes gæst*
fore Cristes cneo,
 Ph. 513 f; cf. Ph. 523, 584;
se us lif forgeaf
leomu, lic and gæst,
 Cr. 776 f.; cf. Cr. 1036 f., 1326 f., 1580 f.
penden gæst and lic Geador siðedan,
 Jul. 714.

The idea in these passages is as old as the story of Creation. For the same thought expressed similarly, compare the following:

¹⁵ Gaebler, p. 27.

leomu lic somod and lifes gæst,

Guð. 810, 1149;

ponne se deað cymed
asyndreð þa sybbe, þe ær samod wæron,
lic and sawle,

B. and S. 3 f.;

ponne feras sceal þurh frean hæse.
sundor anra gehwæs sawol of lice,

Az. 92 f.

Cf. also Gen. 930-1; Met. 20, 234-238.

- (2) *hwæðre his meahta sped*
heah ofer heofonum halig wunade,
 Ph. 640 f.;

sibbe sawað on sefan manna
þurh meahta sped! ic eow mid wunnige,
 Cr. 487 f.

The parallelism here consists solely in the phrase *meahta sped*, and for this compare Dan. 335, Gen. 1696, Met. 4, 9.

- (3) *ne sorg ne slæp ne swar leger,*
 Ph. 56.

nis þær hungor ne þurst
slæp ne swar leger ne sunnan bryne,
 Cr. 1661.

The author of the *Phoenix* is here translating from his originals; cf. *et curae insomnes*, etc., D. A. Ph. 20 f.; cf. also the A.-S. paraphrase of the *De Die Judicii* (*Inter Florigeras*, etc.),

ne cymð ðær sorh ne sar ne geswenced yld,
ne ðær ænig geswinc æfre gelimpeð
oððe hungor oððe þurst, oððe heanlic slæp,
 Be. D.D. 255 f.

- (4) *þær him bitter wearð*
yrmðu æfter æte and hyra eafterum swa,
 Ph. 404 f.;

þæt him bæm gewearð
yrmðu to ealdre and hyra eafterum swa,
 Jul. 503 f.

Cf. Guð. 825 f., also

cwæð þæt sceaðena mæst
eallum heora eafterum æfter siððan
wurde on worulde.

Gen. 549 f.

- (5) *scyldwyrcente in scome byrneð,* Ph. 502.
scyldwyrcente scame þrowian, Jul. 445.

Cf. Guð. 175, 605; also

scealt þu minra zescenda sceame þrowian,
 B. and S. 49;

eal þæt hwæne sceamode scylda on worulde,
Be. D.D. 140;

þonne beoð gescende and scame dreogeð,
Ps. 69, 2.

(6) *onbryrðed breostsefa blissum hremig,*
Ph. 126;
inbryrðed breostsefa, El. 842, 1046.

Cf.

breostum onbryrðed, An. 1120, Guð. 626.

(7) *gefreoða usic frymða scyppend! þu eart*
fæder ælmihtig. Ph. 630;
þu on frymðe wæs fæder ælmihtigum,
Cr. 121.

An unreal parallelism; compare moreover the following,

gefreoða hyre (sawol) and gefeorma hy, fæ-
der moncynnes, Hy. 4, 61;

gefridode frymða waldend. Hyre þæs fæ-
der on roðerum, Jud. 65.

(8) *sib si þe, soð god, and snyttru cræft,*
and þe þonc sy prymsittendum, Ph. 622 f;
sie þe, mægena god
prymsittendum þanc butan ende, El. 810.

The parallelism here consists wholly in the fact that *þanc* and *prymsittendum* occur in the same line, which may be purely accidental; such an expression as *sie þe (gode) þane* is too much of a commonplace expression to have any significance.

(9) *agenne eard eft geseced,* Ph. 264;
agenne eard eft to secan, Ph. 275;
þonne he gewiteð wongas secan
his ealdne eard of ðisse eðeltýrf,
Ph. 320 f.;
his on sybbe forlet secan gehwylcne
agenne eard, El. 598 f.

A mere commonplace; cf. *ham gesecan*, Sat. 436; *eðel secan*, An. 226; *gewat eft ham secan*, B. 2388; *agenne eard*, Met. 20, 14.

(10) *fæðrum gefrætwad,* Ph. 239;
fæðrum gefrætwad El. 743.

A phrase in no way remarkable; compare the similar phrases, *folmum gefrætwod*, B. 992; *gimnum gefrætwod*, Sat. 649.

(11) *heafelan lixað*
prymene biþeahle, Ph. 604 f.;
þe of þæs hælandes heafelan lixte,
Cr. 505.

There is really no parallelism here at all, as the context will make evident.

(12) *ða se æðela wong*
æghwæs onsund wið yðfare
gehealdan stod hreora wæga, Ph. 43 f.;
heo in liges stod
æghwæs onsund, Jul. 592 f.

This is no parallelism at all.

(13) *purh fyres feng fugel mid neste,*
Ph. 215;
in fyres feng folc anra gehwylc,
El. 1287.

There is no agreement in the thought here, and as for the phrase *fyres feng*, cf. B. 1764, Sal. 353.

(14) *gehroden hyhtlice haliges meahtrum,*
Ph. 79;
and efne swa þec gemette meahtrum ge-
hrodene, Cr. 330.

Again no agreement; *meahtrum* has a different meaning, and is in a different construction in each passage.

(15) *þær seo soðfæste sunne lihteð,* Ph. 587;
and soðfæsta sunnan leoma, Cr. 106;
he is soðfæsta sunnan leoma, Cr. 696.

The parallelism here consists practically in the fact that Christ is spoken of as the sun. This, however, is a common enough figure, surely; cf. Vulg. Johannem viii, 12, for example; also,

þæt is seo soða sunne mid rihte,
Met. 30, 17;
þu eart heofontlic leoht, Hy. 8, 22.

(16) *synnum asundrad sumes onlice,* Ph. 242;
asundrod fram synnum swa smæle gold,
El. 1309.

Cf.

asundrad fram synnum,
An. 1245, Hy. 9, 10;
synnum asundrad, Guð. 486.

(17) *purh his hidercyme halgum togeanes,*
Ph. 421;
purh his hidercyme hals eft forgeaf,
Cr. 587.

Cf.

hidercyme pinne, An. 1318;
on his hidercyme, Bl. Hom. 87, 2, etc.

(18) *ece and edgeong æfre ne sweðrað,*
Ph. 608;

ece and edgeong andweard gæð,

Cr. 1071;

ece and edgeong,

Nap. Frag.

This is obviously only a mere alliterative formula.

- (19) *þurh his lices gedal, lif butan ende,*

Ph. 651;

þær is leofra lufu, lif butan endedeade,

Cr. 1653.

Here there is not the slightest resemblance in the general tenor of the thought.

- (20) *bi þam gecornum Cristes pegnum,*

Ph. 388.;

þonne þa gecorenan fore Crist berað,

Cr. 1655;

wið ða gecorenan Cristes pegnas,

Jul. 299.

Cf.

we his pegnas synd

gecoren to cempum,

An. 323 f.;

cempan gecorene Criste leofe,

Guð. 769;

clæne and gecorene Cristes pegnas,

Hy. 7. 53.

- (21)

Sie him lof symle

þurh woruld worulda and wuldres blæd,

Ph. 661 f.;

si him lof symle

þurh woruld worulda wuldor on heofonum,

Cr. 777.

The similarity in wording here is rather close, but the expression is one of the most commonplace imaginable; cf.,

sie þe þanc and lof, þeoda waldend,

to widan feore wuldor on heofonum,

An. 1453 f.;

sægdon lof symble leofum drihtne,

Ps. 77. 5;

wuldor si wide weruda drihtne

and on worulda woruld wunie siððan,

Ps. 103. 29 f.;

þæm drihtne sy lof, and wuldor, and

sibb, on ecnesse

in ealra worulda world, a butan ende,

Bl. Hom. 53. 32;

also such texts as Ps. 40. 14; ii Peter iii. 18.

- (22) *middangeardes and mægenþrymmes,*

Ph. 665;

middangeardes and mægenþrymmes,

Cr. 557, Jul. 154.

The parallelism here is, of course, complete;

but it may possibly be accidental; cf.

eft-wyrd cymð

mægenþrymma mæst ofer middangeard,

Ex. 539 f.

- (23) *beoð ðonne amerede monna gæstas*

beorhte abywde þurh bryne fyres,

Ph. 544 f.¹⁶

seoðeð swearta lig synne on fordonum,

Cr. 995;

hie asodene beoð

asundrod fram synnum swa smæte gold,

El. 1308 f.;

oð ðæt eall hasað ældes leoma

woruldwidles worn wætlme forbærned,

Cr. 1006 f.

The purifying power of the fires of the Last Judgment is a common enough theme in the Scriptures and in the writings of the Fathers; compare, for example, Vulg. Dan. xii. 10; i Pet. i. 7; i Cor. iii. 13-15; Augustine *Sermo* iv (Migne, 39, 1945); Beda, *De Temporum Ratione* (Giles, 6, 337); also, *De Die Iudicii*, 77 f.; Be. D.D. 154 f.

- (24) *þonne monge beoð on gemot læded*

fyra cynnes,

Ph. 491 f.;

þær monig beoð on gemot læded

fore onsyne eces deman,

Cr. 795 f.

Here the parallelism is indeed close; but the thought expressed is perfectly commonplace; cf., for example, *þæt bið pearlic gemot*, Bi. D.D. 36; *on gemotsted manna and engla*, B. and S. 152.

- (25) *fyr bið on tihte*

æled uncyste,

Ph. 525 f.;

brond bið on tihte

æled ealdgestreon unmunlice,

Cr. 812 f.

The likeness in thought, here, is close enough, but in diction it is not very striking.

- (26) *þær þa lichoman leahtra clæne*

gongað glædmode gæstas hweorfað

in banfatu, þonne bryne stigeð

heah to heofonum,

Ph. 518 f.;

þær mægen werge monna cynnes

wornum hweorfað on widne lig,

Cr. 957 f.

There is no parallelism at all here.

- (27) *wel bið ðæm ðe mot*

¹⁶ Gaebler, p. 37.

on þa geomran tid gode lician, Ph. 516 f.;
wel is ðam þe motun
on þa grimman tid gode lician,
Cr. 1080 f.

Cf.,

wel bið ðam ðe mot
æfter deað dæge drihten secean,
B. 186 f.;

wel bið þam þe him are seceð
frofne to fæder on heofonum,
Wand. 114 f.;

gode licode, Ps. 55, 11.

(28)

cyning þrymlice
of his heahsetle halgum scineð
wlitig wuldres gim, Ph. 514 f.;

heofonengla cyning halig scineð
wuldorlic ofer weredum, Cr. 1010 f.

Cf.,

and ymb þæt heh sett hwile standað
engla feðan and eadigra . . .
heora wile scineð
geond ealra worulda woruld mid wuld-
orcyninge, Sat. 220 f.

What now is the value of this list of parallel passages as evidence for a Cynewulfian authorship of the *Phænix*? In all but a few cases the parallelism is either unreal, or trivial; and in the majority of cases the thought expressed is perfectly commonplace. Many of the passages cited by Gaebler refer to the Last Judgment, and their similarity is due to the fact that they are composed of practically the same material¹⁷ and were written at a time when the popular mind was filled with thoughts of the Doom that was believed to be near at hand.¹⁸ Compare, for example, the following:

swa se mihtiga cyning
beodeð brego engla byman stefne
ofan sidne grund, sawla nerġend,
Ph. 497 f.:

þonne fram feowerum foldan sceatum
þam ytemestum eorðan rices
englas ælbeorhte on efen blawað
byman on brehtme, Cr. 879 f.;

drihten seolfa
hateð hehenglas hludra stefne
beman blawan ofer burga gesetu

¹⁷ Cf. Homily v in Morris's Edition of the Bl. Hom.

¹⁸ Cf. Deering: *The Anglo-Saxon Poets of the Judgment Day*.

geond [feower] foldan sceatas,
Sat. 600 f.

What do these passages prove? Simply this, that three A.-S. poets writing on the same subject, using the same materials, and subject to the same severe metrical rules, made use of pretty much the same language to express their thought. Suppose it be admitted, however, that there is a relation between these passages, other than that they are drawn from the same general sources, namely, the Scriptures and writings of the Fathers, what follows? That they were all written by one man? By no means. Take the following case:

wið ða geeorenan Cristes þegnas,
Jul. 229;
clæne and gecorene Cristes þegnas,
Hy. 7, 53.

The similarity in thought and diction here is quite striking as in most of the passages cited by Gaebler from the *Phænix* and C.W. Will anyone seriously contend, now, that these two passages must have been written by one and the same man? Of course not; that would be absurd. If we must admit relationship here, we can only admit that of imitation. So in the case of the *Phænix* and C.W., if there be any relationship at all between them, why may it not be one of imitation, equally as well as one of identity of authorship?

Gaebler's proof, therefore, turns out to be no more than mere assumption. There is no convincing evidence that Cynewulf had anything to do with the *Phænix*; and that being so, we might rest here, since the burden of proof is always on those who wish to make it out that the *Phænix* is the work of Cynewulf. But to make the conclusion more certain, I shall state briefly the evidence that makes against Cynewulfian authorship.

STYLE.

There is not much variety of style in A.-S. poetry. Everywhere we find the same stock of poetic formulas, synonyms, etc.; and this makes it somewhat difficult to distinguish between the work of one A.-S. poet and that of another. In the case of Cynewulf and the *Phænix* poet, this is particularly true, for

they deal with the same class of subjects. There is, however, quite a perceptible shade of difference in the tone in which the two poets write. Cynewulf is disposed to be somewhat gloomy and reflective. He writes as a man overwhelmed with a sense of his own sinfulness, and apprehensive of the punishment that is to be meted out to all sinners alike at the Great Day of Doom. Consider, for example, the following:

*Huru ic wene me
and eac ondræde dom þy reðran,
þonne eft cymed engla þeoden,
þe ic ne heold teala, þæt me hælend min
on bocum bibeað,* Cr. 789 f.

The *Phoenix* poet, on the other hand, is of a sunnier disposition. He looks at the bright side of things. It is not on the terrors of the Day of Judgment that he dwells, but on the prospects of bliss that will, on that day, be opened up to the souls of the blessed. Note, for example, this passage;

*weorc anra gehwæs
heorhte bliceð in ðam bliðan ham
fore onsyne eces dryhtnes
symle in sibbe sunnan gelice,* Ph. 598 f.

The difference in religious temperament between the two poets is further illustrated by the different names they apply to the Deity. To a certain extent, God the Father, and Christ the Son, are confused by both poets; but at times they are carefully distinguished. Cynewulf is more apt to make this distinction than the author of the *Phoenix*. According to Jansen¹⁹ Cynewulf uses 54 different expressions for "Christ" (counting variations, about 200), while for "God" he uses only 37. The *Phoenix* poet, on the other hand, uses 17 different expressions for "God" (counting variations 29), but for "Christ" only 4.

The bright sunny disposition of the *Phoenix* poet, again, is evident from his fondness for expressions for "brightness," "sunshine," etc., as compared with Cynewulf. He uses, for example, eighteen different expressions for "sun," while Cynewulf in all his works uses but six.

It would not be proper, of course, to insist too strongly on these slight variations in style

¹⁹ Jansen: *Beiträge zur Synonymik und Poetik*, München, 1883.

between the *Phoenix* and C. W. The æsthetic quality of a poem is peculiarly elusive, and is not readily reducible to a matter of percentages; so the illustrations I have given must be taken simply for what they are worth. It cannot be denied, however, that the *Phoenix* is, on the whole, a much more lively and spirited piece of work than any of Cynewulf's poems. Its atmosphere is that of the bright open day, whereas Cynewulf's works smell decidedly of the cloister.

METRE.

The first to make a detailed study of the metre of Cynewulf's poems on the basis of Sievers's investigations was Frucht.²⁰ Following him closely Cremer made a comparison of the versification of the signed poems with that of the poems usually ascribed to Cynewulf, the *Andreas*, *Guðlac* and the *Phoenix*; and Mather has virtually reworked the ground covered by Cremer. As to the practical results of these investigations, so far as the Cynewulfian question is concerned, there may be room for some difference of opinion. Perhaps the only thing positively and definitely settled is that *Guðlac A* cannot be by Cynewulf. Both Cremer and Mather, however, are convinced that the *Phoenix* must also be rejected.

I agree with them, of course, in this conclusion, but I do not think the methods by which they have reached it altogether sound. Cremer, for example, limits his comparison to the poems signed by Cynewulf, on the one hand, and those ascribed to him, on the other. But it is not sufficient to show that a certain one of the doubtful poems agrees with, or differs from, C. W. in regard to metrical structure; it must also be shown that a poem which cannot possibly be by Cynewulf will almost certainly differ considerably from his standard. In other words, the validity of the metrical test must first be made clear. The importance of this point seems to have been felt by Mather; and he, accordingly, introduced the *Beowulf* into his comparison. In the next place, both Cremer and Mather make the assumption that a close agreement

²⁰ P. Frucht: *Metrisches und sprachliches zur Cynewulf's Elene, Juliana und Crist*, Greifswalder Diss., 1887.

in metrical structure between two or more poems necessarily means identity of authorship. That such agreement might be the result of imitation, seems, however, quite possible. Again, Mather criticises Cremer for practically making the assumption "that in the three signed poems we have the limits of Cynewulf's style."²¹ He himself, however, is very much inclined to emphasize unduly moderate variations from Cynewulf's average use. He lays down the rule that

"only those divergencies are rated for criteria of authorship, which are considerably greater than the differences shown in the same case among the Cynewulfian poems. The practical working of this is that in general only differences of one-fourth or over are observed."²²

If we examine Mather's tables, now, we find that, in the first half-line, Cynewulf varies in his use of type B from 141 [Cremer 145], per 1000 lines, in *Jul.* to 190 in *Cr. i*,²³ and 200 in *Cr. ii*,²³ but both 190 and 200 exceed 141 by more than one-fourth [reckoning from the lower number]. Similarly in the second half-line, Cynewulf varies in the use of type A

from 357 per 1000 lines in *El.* to 448 in *Cr. ii*—again a variation slightly greater than one-fourth. This shows that a variation of one-fourth is rather too small to be significant.

With regard to Cremer's comparison of similar types in each half-line, it is, as Mather points out, not only worthless, but misleading. His method of comparing the different ways of forming the long line, also, strikes me as rather unfruitful. The grouping together of types A, D and E as "descending," of B and C as "ascending" has little or no justification from the point of view of rhythm. A long line of the form AE, for example, has a rhythmical movement altogether different from that formed by the combination AA.

Since my scansion of the *Phoenix* and of the Cynewulfian poems differs, though not to any great extent, from both Cremer's and Mather's, I may as well give my results. For the sake of comparison, I give, in addition the figures for *Beowulf*, and for a portion of the *Exodus* and of the *Daniel*.

COMPARISON OF TYPES IN EACH HALF-LINE.¹

	Type.	El.	Cr.	Jul.	Ph.	B.	Ex.	Dan.
	Double Allit.	435	438	437	611	497	520	462
I.	A	426	426	454	490	551	412	477
	B	152	154	150	153	94	112	137
	C	208	166	192	139	162	192	119
	D	160	162	170	177	147	232	97
	E	42	74	34	38	40	48	40

²¹ Cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES vii, 199.

²² MOD. LANG. NOTES, vii, 202.

²³ Mather's *Cr. i* and *Cr. ii*—Cremer's *Cr. a.*—*Cr. i*—778.

¹ On the basis of 1000 lines. The figures for B. and for double alliteration are from Mather's tables. The lines used in each poem were: *El.* 1-500; *Cr.* 866-1366; *Jul.* 1-500; *Ph.* 1-667; *Ex.* 1-250; *Dan.* 1-279.

	Type.	El.	Cr.	Jul.	Ph.	B.	En.	Dan.
	Double Allt.							
II.	A	406	454	400	435	362	536	393
	B	252	242	284	294	233	112	177
	C	192	152	218	197	182	88	199
	D	90	58	52	40	110	56	61
	E	48	76	46	31	108	204	40
	Remainder.	12	18	—	3	4	4	36

The only important variations between the the *Phœnix* and C.W., which this table shows, is in the use of double alliteration, which in the *Phœnix* is much more than a third greater than any of C.W., and in the use of D and E types taken together in the second half-line. In general, however, C.W. agree much more closely with each other than does any one of them with the *Phœnix*, an indication, though of course not a very strong one, of difference of authorship.

In the following table are given the various

modes of forming the long line in each of the poems in question. The comparison is again on a basis of 1000 lines. The figures for *Beowulf* are taken from Kaluza's tables.²⁴ It may be noted here that Kaluza's "vierhebungstheorie" gives practically the same results as Sievers' scheme, since both make, in effect, six types.²⁵

²⁴ Cf. Kaluza; *Studien zur Germanischen Alliterationsverse*, ii, 87.

²⁵ Cf. *Ibid.* i, 89.

COMPARISON OF MODES OF FORMING THE LONG LINE.

Form of line.	El.	Cr.	Jul.	Ph.	B.	Ex.	Dan.
AA	128	138	122	160	52	136	180
AB	132	128	162	170	159	64	108
AC	108	84	134	123	140	60	130
AD	44	26	14	19	92	24	40
AE	14	50	22	18	45	128	18
BA	80	78	90	86	69	84	76
BB	28	36	24	31	4	8	22
BC	14	16	18	26	12	4	18
BD	16	14	14	6	25	4	4
BE	14	10	4	4	2	12	18
CA	126	100	124	95	129	136	79
CB	24	26	14	18	13	8	11
CC	32	18	34	15	22	12	14
CD	12	12	10	7	19	4	11
CE	14	10	10	5	5	32	4
DA	58	94	54	73	81	152	43
DB	52	36	70	66	30	24	25
DC	30	24	28	26	23	8	22
DD	14	4	12	7	19	20	7
DE	6	4	8	5	6	28	0
EA	14	44	12	21	22	28	14
EB	16	16	14	9	13	8	11
EC	8	10	4	7	8	4	4
ED	4	2	2	0	21	4	0
EE	0	2	2	0	0	4	0
Remainder.	12	18	—	3	3	4	36

This table shows no striking variation between the *Phœnix* and C.W.; but it shows, nevertheless, like the preceding, that C.W. agree much more closely with each other than any of them with the *Phœnix*; that is to say, this table indicates, though not decisively, that the *Phœnix* is not a Cynewulfian poem.

LANGUAGE.

The poems of Cynewulf, as well as those usually ascribed to him, have come down to us, of course, in the West-Saxon dialect; but

there is not much doubt now that they were written originally in the Northumbrian dialect.²⁶ Though the original dialect of the *Phœnix*, therefore, must be regarded as the same as C.W., there are, however, some particulars in which it differs from them. These are as follows:²⁷ *fæder*, dat. sing. Ph. 610; *fædere*, El. 438, 454, Cr. 464, 532, 773; *fotas*, Ph. 311, (*loðæs?* 407); *fet*, Cr. 1111,

²⁶ Cf. Leiding: *Die Sprache der Cynewulf Dichtungen*, *Crist, Juliana, und Elene*; Marburg, 1888.

²⁷ Cf. Sievers: *Beiträge*, x, 483 f.; Cremer, p. 44.

1169, Jul. 472, El. 1066; *glæd* (on the strength of the metre) Ph. 92, 289, 303, 593; *glæd*, Cr. 1287.

These differences are highly significant, and decidedly make against the supposition of a Cynewulfian authorship for the *Phoenix*. Cynewulf himself does, indeed, vary slightly in his use of a few forms, for example, *ham*, dat. sing., Cr. 305; *hame*, Cr. 293; but he does not permit himself quite so radical a variation as to use *fotas* for *fet*.

CONCLUSION.

The question of the authorship of the *Phoenix*, accordingly, stands thus: In the first place, there is absolutely no strong evidence which makes for a Cynewulfian authorship, the evidence advanced by Gaebler from vocabulary, characteristic phrases, and parallel passages being too weak to be regarded as anything like convincing. In the second place, there is much that makes decidedly against such a supposition: first, in the point of style; second, in versification; and third, in grammar. Lastly there is the lack of Cynewulf's signature—presumably attached to all, since attached to at least four of his poems; and this, in the absence of strong evidence for, should be conclusive against, a Cynewulfian authorship.

EDWARD FULTON.

Wells College.

NOTE UPON SOME SIMILARITIES BETWEEN *Le Grand Cyrus* AND *Le Misanthrope*.

Mlle. de Scudéry has never been satisfactorily cleared of the accusation of having served as the model of the *précieuses*, the most ridiculed of the seventeenth century. Boileau and Molière, the bitterest assailants of the *genre*, have been accused in their turn of having been signally unjust toward this particular *précieuse*: they are still from time to time arraigned and acquitted without calling out any final verdict.

If Molière did direct unjustly some *traits* against Mademoiselle de Scudéry, he and she nevertheless sometimes strangely resemble each other in thought and theory. Victor

Cousin has pointed out¹ the striking similarity between certain passages of *Le Grand Cyrus* and of *Les Femmes Savantes*;—similarity singularly piquant, since these passages express the views of the two authors upon what should be a woman's attitude toward learning. It is well known that the *Comédie Pastorale: Mélite*, never completed by Molière, is based upon an episode of *Le Grand Cyrus*.² It seems possible that the perusal of the ten interminable volumes of this same novel may have left other traces in the work of Molière.

Mélite was represented for the first time in December, 1666. The *Misanthrope* appeared for the first time in Paris in June of the same year. It would seem that at that time the novel of Mlle. de Scudéry may have been more or less in Molière's mind, for the fourth volume of *Le Grand Cyrus* contains an episode, *L'histoire de Cléonice et de Ligdamis*,⁴ which can profitably be read with certain passages of the *Misanthrope*.⁵

The question which one naturally asks one's self in reading this episode is perhaps unanswerable; that is, did Molière consciously or unconsciously have in mind certain passages of it when writing the famous interview between Celimène and Arsinoé? At any rate the resemblances and differences are such as to render the reading of the corresponding passages interesting to those interested in the history of the *précieuses*.

Molière being Molière, every word of the *Misanthrope* tingles with vivacity and malice. Mlle. de Scudéry being the gracious, well-meaning person that her ten volumes reveal to us; the malice and vivacity of which she has no mean share, run a slender graceful thread through the rather prolix *badinage* of an interview unlike and yet not unlike the famous dialogue of Molière's *Misanthrope*. The two personages are a prude and a coquette, but Cléonice, very different from Arsinoé who,

¹ Victor Cousin: *La Société Française au 17^e. Siècle*. Paris, 1853. Tome ii, pp. 173, and 295 ff.

² *Artamène, ou Le Grand Cyrus*. Rouen, 1654. Chez Augustin Courbe.

³ Tome vi, Livre 2, pp. 346-470.

⁴ *Le Grand Cyrus*, Tome iv, Livre 3, pp. 406-572.

⁵ *Le Misanthrope*, Act iii, Sc. 3; Act v, Sc. 4.

Contre ce siècle aveugle est toujours en courroux,
Elle tâche à couvrir d'un faux voile de prude
Ce qu'on voit chez elle d'affreuse solitude.

is a prude after Mlle. de Scudéry's own heart, visionary, virtuous, Platonic and of invincible attractions.

This

"adorable fille attirait tout ce qu'il y avait d'honnêtes gens en ce lieu là tout le monde voulant avoir la gloire d'être de ses premiers amis, et de lui avoir rendu les premiers services."

The coquette, veritable coquette, Mlle. de Scudéry paints, with becoming reservations, in as attractive a light as the "charmant esprit," Cléonice.

"Car à dire les choses comme elles sont, elle a tant de charmes en toute sa personne, et tant d'agrément en toutes ses actions qu'il n'est pas aisé de se défendre de l'aimer des qu'on la voit; étant certain qu'il y a dans ses yeux, je ne sais quel enjouement obligeant et passionné qui émeut le cœur de tous ceux qui la voient. Mais Madame pour achever de vous dépeindre Arteline, qui a assez de part à cette histoire, il faut que vous sachiez qu'il n'a jamais été une personne plus coquette que celle-là. Car non seulement elle voulait gagner ses amants par sa beauté et son esprit, mais aussi par ses soins et par sa civilité."

Being equally attractive, and very good friends, as friends go, these two persons lack the dramatic value of the Arsinoé and Célimène of Molière.⁶ They say, however, to each other with the frankest kindliness and gentle malice some of the same things that the rivals of *Le Misanthrope* sling with such bitter irony into each other's faces.

Cléonice impelled by the same motive professed by Arsinoé; "voulant lui persuader qu'elle faisait tort à sa beauté de souffrir que tant de gens espérassent de pouvoir posséder son cœur," reproaches Arteline:

"Car enfin, lui disait Cléonice, vous ne m'en ferez point croire que cette multitude qui vous suivent, vous suivent sans espérer, et vous ne m'en ferez pas croire non plus qu'ils puissent tous espérer si vous n'y contribuez rien. Vous voulez qu'on vous regarde, vous regardez les autres: vous donnez quelques

⁶ It is interesting to note in passing that Cléonice and Arteline are in a certain way rivals for the favor of Lig. damis; a *Misanthrope* so far as an extreme aversion for the passion of love is concerned. He breaks with a friend just as soon as this friend falls in love.

assignations et quoique je sache que tout cela aboutit à dire trois ou quatre paroles en secret et à faire un grand mystère de peu de chose; c'est un secret, c'est un mystère et par conséquent, un crime, parceque à parler raisonnablement, on ne se cache point pour une chose innocente, comment voulez-vous que des gens que vous accablez de faveurs n'espèrent pas tout ce qu'on peut espérer? Ne songez-vous pas que la jeunesse ne dure pas toujours et que la vieillesse et la galanterie ont une antipathie si grande qu'il n'y a rien de si opposé? Comment ferez-vous donc quand tous vos galants vous abandonneront?"

For Célimène's:

"L'âge amènera tout et ce n'est pas le temps
Madame, comme on sait, d'être prude à vingt ans."

Arteline replies:

"Ne soyons pas si prévoyantes, car pour moi, je me trouve si bien de ne songer point à tant de choses que je ne veux pas croire votre conseil ni devenir trop prudente de peur d'être malheureuse. Il me suffit quand je suis à la saison des roses de regarder dans mon miroir si le peu de beauté que j'ai ne durera pas jusqu'aux premières violettes et quand je m'en suis assurée je me mets l'esprit en repos."

None of the accusations of Molière's Célimène are applicable here.⁷ Arteline merely points out brightly the great danger incurred by the "froides et sérieuses, qui font les fières et cruelles," of allowing their hearts to be seriously touched at last. And, she adds:

"Si je n'avais pas peur que vous ne dérobassiez mon secret et qu'il ne vous prît envie de vous en servir je vous découvrirais le fond de mon cœur."

This, although of widely different import, recalls Célimène's answer to Arsinoé's "L'on a des amants quand on en veut avoir."

"Ayez en donc Madame, et voyons cette affaire,
Par ce rare secret efforcez vous de plaire."

They part the best of friends, but not until Cléonice has suggested the situation which Molière employs to prepare the *dénouement* of his play:⁸

"Vous dites de petits secrets à l'un, vous raillez des autres avec quelqu'un d'eux, et

⁷ Molière probably did not have Mlle. de Scudéry in mind when he wrote:

"Elle fait des tableaux couvrir les nudités,"

but one thinks involuntarily of her "modestly draped Venuses," in reading the isolated line.

⁸ *Le Misanthrope*, Act iii, Sc. 2, end. The agreement between the two Marquises.

quoique vous vous moquez de tout le monde, je trouve pourtant que vous avez lieu de craindre qu'à la fin tous ces gens ne se moquent aussi de vous. Car enfin s'il prenait un jour fantaisie à tous ces amants de s'entendre tout ce que vous avez fait pour eux, ou seriez vous?"

The final punishment of Artelinde is brought about in much the same way as that of Célimène. She writes to all of her different admirers arranging appointments with them. Through an interchange of address all the letters arrive at the wrong destination, and Artelinde becomes the laughing stock of the town. Cléonice, for all her Christian charity, is not above enjoying the confusion of her dearest foe.

To any one who takes the trouble to read the passages above indicated, a general resemblance cannot fail to present itself. Is this similarity merely accidental—such as would arise from the treatment of two subjects not wholly dissimilar? Mlle. de Scudéry wishing to paint the delights of an "amitié tendre" and to point at the same time a moral for coquettes who harden their hearts to such delight; Molière pointing the same moral how-beit with very different intent. At any rate, it is interesting to find that the same woman who has often been supposed to have been the target of the malicious shafts lanced by Molière against prudes, has painted a coquette having much in common with Célimène,⁹ and that a prude can say agreeably the disagreeable speeches of Arsinoé.

ANNE REESE PUGH.

Wellesley College.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

Modern German Literature. By BENJAMIN W. WELLS, Ph. D. 12mo, pp. ix, 406. Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1895.

No other book of the year seems to me to deserve a more hearty welcome from the American student and teacher of German literature than Dr. Wells' series of essays or chapters on this subject. The reader feels himself guided by an earnest, well-balanced student, capable of sifting his materials and choosing out of the vast mass only the most

⁹ This is not the only instance to be found in Mlle. de Scudéry's works of sympathetic pictures of coquettes and of coquetry. They appear frequently, especially in the *Entretiens*.

characteristic and most helpful facts for the American college or university student. Dr. Wells does not write for Germanists, but for cultured foreigners. "They will want to know," he tells us in his preface,

"not about the 'Muspilli' or the 'Wessobrunn Prayer,' but, first of all, about what men are writing and reading now, and then about what they continue to read of the works of the older generation."

With this as his platform, he discusses: I. The Origins; II. The First Fruits, Klopstock, Wieland, Herder; III. Lessing, the Reformer; IV. The Young Goethe; V. Goethe's Manhood and Old Age; VI. Goethe's "Faust;" VII. Schiller's Early Years; VIII. Schiller on the Height; IX. Richter and the Romantic School; X. Heinrich Heine; XI. Imaginative Literature Since 1850. To these eleven essays is added a full index to authors and their more important works.

The author does not pretend to encyclopædic completeness. His sole aim is "to further literary appreciation and enjoyment." He does not strive so much to be original in treatment as to be judicious in selecting and forceful in presenting essentials. The style is easy and natural. Biographic details are freely intermingled with literary estimates and criticisms, the whole, however, presenting a homogeneous and organic narrative.

The book is distinctly a student's companion. The foreign student is almost necessarily curtailed in his enjoyment and appreciation of the better things in German literature. Often does the spirit escape in the laborious dissecting process of grammatical analysis. Frequently textual difficulties leave nothing but "the lees to brag of." Dr. Wells labors to minimize this danger and to imbue the learner with the conviction that he is, indeed, pursuing an intellectual movement, and that he is being brought in contact with forces that have molded the life and thought of the nation, and which in turn have been molded by these.

In the 'Origins' we have a condensed yet clear-cut sketch of the main lines of literary development prior to the eighteenth century awakening. There is a close relationship, more observable in German literature than in any other, between the national or political feeling of exaltation and its expression in

literature. Three waves and three subsidings are easily distinguished, the former reaching their height, approximately, at the beginning of the sixth, the twelfth, and the eighteenth centuries, respectively. The Teutonic conquest of the Roman World, the self-assertion of Teutonic strength, afforded poetic material both for the early and the succeeding ages. Legends, myths, historic accounts dimmed and fused. When the Roman Church conquered the conquerors, the *Heliand*, the *Krist* took the place of the earlier distinctly national sagas. The *Hildebrandslied*, the *Beowulf* and the existence of later legends testify to a period of poetic activity. Charlemagne had fostered his native tongue, had collected the remains of the old heathen poetry, but his work was not preserved. Under the wise policy of the Ottos and their successors the national spirit again asserted itself, a distinct national individuality was developed, the older legends of fame and prowess were remembered, a second period of classic literature was a-making.

The Crusades had aroused the Western nations. There was an interchange of thought and speculation. It was the age of chivalry. The *Nibelungenlied*, the *Gudrun* and that whole splendid galaxy of literary monuments—mostly between 1190-1220—was the result. The translation of the *Chanson de Roland* had preceded, 1130. So had *King Rother*, and *Herzog Ernst*. It was

"the age when Frederic II. and Saladin contended for the palm of magnanimity, while the great poets of the century, Walther and Wolfram, anticipated Lessing's *Nathan der Weise* in their philosophic conception and bold teaching of universal toleration."

Veldeke had perfected rhyme and rhythm in German verse. Though greatly influenced by the French he stands the "Father of Courtly Poetry." His successors, Hartmann von Aue, and Gottfried von Strassburg represent successive stages in the development of the court epic; the former, its summit, the latter, by reason of his over-refinement and artificiality, its decline.

Wolfram was *sui generis*, standing between the popular and the courtly poets. In his two epics, *Parcival* and *Willehalm* we have the best expression of the Middle Ages on ques-

tions of great spiritual import: religious toleration, freedom of the will, relation of differing faiths to each other, self-redemption through toil and steadfast effort.

After the brilliant poetic activity of Walther von der Vogelweide the same line of descent marked lyric poetry that had marked the epic. "It suffered first from artificiality, then from vulgarization." By gradual stages the palm that had been held by genius passed into the hands of the 'Meistersänger,' those prosaic burgher-singers of the thirteenth and the succeeding centuries. Poetry was nothing more than doggerel; song-making, a craft. Speaking of the works of Hans Sachs' contemporaries, Dr. Wells says that they "are buried deep, lapped in the lead of their own dullness."

The Reformation produced much polemical writing, little that was poetic. Despite the more perfect literary medium fostered and largely created by Luther in his Bible, pure literature could not take root. The energies of the German people were bent on more vital questions. Freedom of conscience, religious toleration had to be contended for and won before the dawn of the new era, under Frederic the Great. Under that monarch national self-consciousness was regained fully and it found its fitting expression in Klopstock and still more in Lessing and his successors.

Klopstock was an idealist living in the past. The sensible world eluded his grasp, he lacked the power of characterization. Everywhere in his *Messias* we find pietistic contemplation submerging the epic movement. His influence on literature was chiefly indirect. Prosody, versification was more closely studied by him than by his predecessors.

Frederic did not sympathize with Klopstockian tendencies. He felt that the national spirit must learn to express itself in broader terms and reflect more adequately the intellectual status of the age. As for Wieland's influence, it was, of course, much more marked. His light-hearted frivolity, his delight in the sensuous, his vivid fancy and delicate diction conquered him a ready dominion. "All High Germany owes its style to Wieland," says Goethe; "it has learned many things from him and not the least of them

the ability to express itself with propriety." Through his translation of Shakespere German literature received an immense impulse. Much of Wieland's literary activity was of an ephemeral character; still, he has earned the right to the esteem of his countrymen, in that he did brave battle for ideas that are now part and parcel of the literature of to-day.

There was more affinity between Lessing and Herder than between Wieland and Lessing. Herder is not read much now, not so much because we have outgrown him, as because, in power of thought and eloquence of diction, Goethe and Schiller over-topped him. Herder's mental horizon was vast but not always clear. He was at his best interpreting others. For that reason his *Stimmen der Völker* commends him most to posterity. In that work he could display his sympathetic nature best. He had but little creative power, but admirable gift of interpretation and construction. He was a teacher rather than a prophet, a guide, rather than an original, impelling, inspiring force.

Dr. Wells' treatment of 'Lessing, the Reformer' seems to me especially satisfactory. With wide, bold strokes does he bring the personality of the great emancipator before us. We have a discussion of the times, circumstances and meaning of *Minna von Barnhelm*, of *Nathan*, the *Laocöon*, the *Hamburg Dramaturgy*, *Emilia Galotti*. Everywhere the student is made to feel the pulse of literature throbbing and palpitating. The relation of the stage to art, of literature to life, of traditionalism to growth and progress, of religious systems to each other, as Lessing analyzed and understood these questions, are set forth tellingly and vividly. The reader feels that, in Lessing, a new force had been brought to bear on German literature. "The honor of emancipating German literature from false standards is his alone," says our author. Though the critic's labors were Lessing's strongest side, modern times have learned to admire his constructive gifts, his other bequests to after-generations. In them breathes a wide human spirit, an anticipation of nineteenth century ideals.

In discussing Goethe (chapters iv, v, vi) the author shows the same temperate, sane judg-

ment. He gives us a sober, yet sympathetic life-picture of the man and the poet and, on the whole, an adequate discussion of his works. Occasionally the desire for brevity leads to statements rather harsher than intended. "She—Iphigenia—awakens dramatic interest almost solely by her effort and failure to lie with a straight face." "Its [the play's] ethical ideals are unripe and unnatural." We cannot agree to this. Both *Tasso* and *Iphigenie* are psychological dramas and must be judged and appreciated from that standpoint. Speaking of *Hermann und Dorothea* we are told:

"Beneath an apparently simple story we have the contrast of two great impulses of human nature, the *migratory desire of change* [italics are mine], the restless, reforming, iconoclastic spirit, and the slow, conservative, accretive mind that feels an instinctive dread of change, as though it were like a tree that cannot be transplanted without losing some increment of growth."

The migratory *desire* is certainly hard to discover in the emigrant train.

Here is a neat little pen-picture: "No blue-stocking she [the Duchess Amalie]; rather, a bright, joyous woman, a good dancer, fond of masked balls, and even a little polite gambling." And this:

"Charlotte von Stein was the first woman whom Goethe had known intimately, who was socially his superior, intellectually capable of sympathizing with him, and whose ethical views would not bend to his own. . . . If at times he broke through the bounds her sense of propriety induced her to draw, there might be brief stormy scenes; but he always came back submissive after these 'sun-showers of love' to her for whom he cannot find names of sufficiently extravagant endearment. He 'worships' her, she is his 'golden lady,' his 'holy fate,' his 'soother' and 'comforter,' his 'dear angel.'"

In the chapter on *Faust*, Dr. Wells examines the play historically, pointing out its chronological and other difficulties. The admirable summary of the present state of criticism as given by Dr. Thomas is put under frequent contribution. There is no attempt at "philosophizing" or "interpreting," except in the few pages devoted to the Second Part. There, without entering the polemical arena, the author discusses the trend of thought and

philosophy underlying. He reaches the conclusion that

"*Faust*, if rightly apprehended, offers two poisons, each an antidote of the other, which joined together help and strengthen. Neither Euphorion's idealism that will not touch the earth, nor, Mephistopheles' realism that will not rise above it, but that just balance that idealizes the real and realizes the ideal,—that is the world wisdom of *Faust*."

Schiller's early experiences and efforts, the course of his development from the bombastic, absurd *Robbers* to the clear heights of *Tell* or *Maria Stuart* or *Wallenstein* forms the subject of the next two chapters. Schiller 'On the Height' is no longer the social iconoclast of earlier days. "In his prime his influence was rather fructifying, refining, emancipating,—in language, in art, and in social and political life." True, the present age retreats more and more from Schiller's ideals of literary requirements. Perhaps we ought to love and revere him more for the effect his art had on Goethe and on elevating popular literary tastes in his day and generation, than in the intrinsic depth and worth of his labors. This sounds like heresy, yet we are disposed to agree quite largely with the author's estimate, when he says:

"At times there seems to have been danger that Schiller would become a poet of the school room. But to make him that alone would do grievous injustice to the battle he fought, and the victory he contributed in no small measure to win, for those ideals of truth and beauty to which he dedicated his life. And, though our credence in these should be outworn, the fruit of his inspiring friendship in the rich aftermath of Goethe's productivity should secure him a grateful and enduring memory."

Much that is said in the chapters on Richter, Heine and the modern period is exceedingly helpful and suggestive. The ultra-conservative as well as the ultra progressive student would find objections to the calm, dispassionate estimates given. In the chapter on 'Imaginative Literature Since 1850' the treatment is too condensed and encyclopedic to produce the effect the rest of the volume has. Up to the last essay, the materials for independent judgment are furnished. There is no glossing over, little or no hero-worship, nor, on the other hand, is there any super-

sensitive Puritanism. The reader cannot fail to have a juster view of Heine and his labors, of the conditions and limitations under which he lived and wrote, of the range and quality of his genius, when he has perused the forty pages devoted to him. Here, as elsewhere in the volume, we have a simple, straightforward exposition of what, to the vast majority of foreign students, must be the bone and sinew of the study of German.

Some few typographical errors have crept in; as, p. 11, 'holly'; p. 70, 'Volker'; p. 93, 'Wulfenbüttel'; p. 112, 'Dicht unguend'; p. 185, 'ccntury'; p. 257, 'Kräniche'; p. 258, 'Burgschaft.' Why Dr. Wells writes 'Friedericke Biron,' pp. 119, 137, 401, instead of 'Brion' I cannot say.

LAURENCE FOSSLER.

University of Nebraska.

GERMAN LANGUAGE.

Unsere Muttersprache, ihr Werden und ihr Wesen, von Professor O. Weise. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1895. 8vo, pp. ix, 252.

THIS attractive little book has earned its author the prize offered by the *Allgemeiner deutscher Sprachverein* for an essay of the following character:

"Die Arbeit soll eine auf wissenschaftlichem Boden ruhende, gemein verständliche und übersichtliche Schilderung der räumlichen und zeitlichen Entwicklung unserer Sprache sein, die das Hauptgewicht auf das Neuhochdeutsche legt. An diese kurz gefasste Geschichte der Muttersprache soll sich eine anregende Darstellung der gemeinen hochdeutschen Sprache unserer Zeit schliessen, die nicht in der Form einer lehrmässigen Übersicht oder eines Nachschlagebuchs, sondern als eine lebendige und anschauliche Erörterung gedacht ist und zwar in einer Weise, die geeignet erscheint, die äusserliche Auffassung vom Wesen der Sprache zu bekämpfen und die weiten Kreise der Gebildeten zu fesseln und zu unterrichten" (p. iii).

The writer has clearly conceived and constantly borne in mind the object of the *Verein*, and no general terms could better describe his work than those of the conditions which it was written to fulfil. It is essentially a "popular" book. One would think it could hardly fail to become popular in Germany; for its readable and intensely patriotic narrative sets

forth a considerable array of facts about their language, in which a large portion of the German public must be glad to be so pleasantly instructed. As to foreign readers, one cannot speak so unreservedly; yet those who can make allowances for a rather absurd type of German patriotism will find much here to interest and edify. The treatise is elementary, and intelligible to anyone that can read German. To the advantages, however, of a "vivid and untechnical discussion"—not free from dangers of its own kind—must be reckoned as disadvantages the necessary brevity of treatment accorded to purely linguistic phenomena, and the impossibility of introducing material in an order satisfactory from the point of view of linguistic science. Professor Weise has neither avoided these dangers nor overcome these disadvantages. A good deal of his philology would lose its force to one not already familiar with the truths it embodies, and on the other hand, the fallacious metaphors which it has been the most earnest endeavor of the modern school to avoid, flourish in this book like a green bay tree. Furthermore, that must be regarded as an extremely unhappy arrangement which devotes but one chapter of thirty-six pages to a historical sketch of the German language, and begs the reader, as Professor Weise does, to take each of the following chapters as supplementary to the first; especially when those chapters are occupied with comparatively unrelated topics like "Beziehung der Sprache zur Volksart," "Die Stammesart (Ober- und Niederdeutschland)" and "Die Standesunterschiede (Mundart und Schriftsprache)." The author circles about his subject, surveying it from different sides, while all historical data are introduced by the way, as they happen to serve his immediate purposes.

The author has his eye mostly on the *Wesen* of the language, and his treatment of it is much more satisfactory than his treatment of the *Werden*; yet for most purposes the *Werden* is the more important matter. With respect to this, the best thing that can be said of the book is, perhaps, that it is a sort of etymological dictionary in connected discourse—not, to be sure, a book of reference for individual words, for in spite of the index

added to the second edition it is not adapted to the purposes of a dictionary, but a series of essays in which the etymology of a long list of words is given incidentally. In his discussion of the *Wesen*, Professor Weise has pointed out many significant features of modern German, and theorized largely about the differences between German and other languages, and about the source of these differences in national character. A good part of what he says is self-evident; for instance,

"Er [i.e. der Wortschatz] sagt uns, dass wir von den Oberdeutschen mit den Eigentümlichkeiten des Hochgebirges bekannt gemacht worden und bei den Niederdeutschen im Seewesen in die Lehre gegangen sind" (p. 67),

and much else, not so certain. In either case, there is nowadays no place in howsoever a "lebendige und anschauliche Erörterung" for such expressions as:

"Die Germanen umwohnen, in mehrere Zweige geschieden, die Gestade der Ostsee. Aber wie siedendes Wasser leicht überwallt, so ist auch die überschäumende Kraft des wanderlustigen Volkes noch nicht zur Ruhe gekommen, so sucht auch seine Sprache bald die Fesseln der altüberlieferten Form zu sprengen. Während die Genossen der Urzeit, die übrigen Indogermanen, bis dahin mehr die weichen Selbstlauter, das zarte Fleisch des Wortkörpers, angetastet hatten, waren die Schläge, die die Germanen unbewusst ihrer Sprache, versetzten, vornehmlich gegen die härteren Mitlauter, das feste Knochengerüst am Leibe der Wörter gerichtet" (p. 2).

How people can strike such blows unconsciously is a mystery, unless it be after the manner of Just in *Minna von Barnhelm*, and then it is a wonder that the people are not awakened by the movement. More misleading still:

"Steht die freie Behandlung der Geräuschlaute (Lautverschiebung) mit dem kühnen Freiheitssinn und dem unbändigen Thatendurst der alten Germanen im Einklang, so zeigt ihr Verfahren gegen den Wortton, dass sie bald den Inhalt höher schätzen lernten als die Form, das Wesen höher als den Schein."

It would be easy but needless to multiply these examples. Those given indicate sufficiently either that the author holds entirely erroneous views concerning the *Wesen* of language and the causes underlying sound-changes, or that he indulges in figures of speech to an extent which precludes a clear

and accurate presentation of such matters. Infelicities of expression involving misapprehension of matters of fact are equally numerous.

The chapter on the "Wortschatz ein Spiegel der Gesittung" (pp. 87 ff.), for example, suggests more than one query as to historical accuracy. There is no precise indication as to what the period under discussion is, though most of the signs point to remote antiquity. The author speaks of the possession of herds by the Germanic forefathers, of the use of cattle as currency, and adds:

"In der Wendung 'eine Schuld beitreiben' schimmert noch deutlich die Erinnerung an eine Zeit durch, wo die Schuld in wirklich gangbarer, d. h. vierbeiniger Münze beglichen wurde. Endlich lassen die Worte 'seine Haut zu Markte tragen' noch ziemlich klar erkennen, dass man einst die Häute seiner geschlachteten Haustiere als Bussgeld verwendete" (p. 91).

... "Vom Vieh ist auch die übertragene Bedeutung des Umstandswortes 'überhaupt' hergenommen; *über houbet*, d. h. 'über die Häupter des Viehs hinweg'" (*ibid.* Note 4).

I fancy it would be difficult to trace these expressions back to a time anywhere near the period described; *überhaupt* and *gangbar* are not found until the late Middle High German period, the latter appearing first in negative form (cf. Grimm, Kluge). The same criticism applies to *unter den Hammer kommen* (p. 99), referred to the hammer of Thor and the "steinerne Hammer von unseren Vorfahren noch als Waffe benutzt," and *eine Zeichnung entwerfen* (p. 101, Note 4) derived from the "Sitte des Runenwerfens." Of like character is the curiously naïve remark:

"Die ehelichen Verhältnisse waren gut; natürlich fehlte es auch nicht an Ausnahmen. Die Stabreimformel 'Kind und Kegel' ... giebt in dieser Hinsicht zu denken" (p. 96).

Kegel is like *überhaupt*, a Middle High German word.

In comparing Middle with New High German, Professor Weise is infelicitous when he says: (p. 13) "die Fürwörter boten vielfach andere Formen: *des, wes, der, den*=*dessen, wessen, deren, denen*." Of course, it is the latter forms that need explanation, not the former. Again, in contrasting German with French accent he says:

"Im Deutschen liegt schon seit sehr langer Zeit der Hauptnachdruck meist auf der Stammsilbe, welche die Bedeutung, den eigentlichen Gehalt des Wortes in sich schliesst, ... "Diese Regel erleidet meist nur in dem Fall eine Ausnahme, wenn eine andere Silbe für den Wortsinn von ausschlaggebender Wichtigkeit ist: z. B. unklar als Gegensatz zu klar." (pp. 44 f. and note).

The omission of such obvious exceptions as compound nouns and separably compounded verbs, is significant of the method which does not undertake to tell the whole truth in matters of this kind. Verbs fare no better. The relation of *kann* and *kennen* is beyond question; yet it is certainly not in the proportion, "*kann: kennen*=*gewann: gewinnen*" (p. 144); so, "Bei den schwachen [Verben] ... bleibt der Stamm fast durchweg unverändert" (p. 140), but why not adduce the classes of *bringen* and *brennen* instead of saying "fast durchweg"? And why not explain the formation of causative from active verbs instead of contenting one's self with:

"Zu einem Mittel der Unterscheidung zwischen zielender (transitiver) und zielloser (intransitiver) Form ist die Wahl (!) der Abwandlungsart geworden bei erschreckte: *erschreck*, *schwellte*: *schwell*, *löschte*: *erlosch*, *verderbte*: *verdarb*" (p. 145).

It would be well also to mention the change of Germanic *ē* to *i* before the *u* of the personal ending in the present indicative of strong verbs (cf. ahd. *hilfu, gibu*) by way of supplement to "Selten wird *ē* zu *i* vor folgendem *u*; z. B., in *situ*, *Sitte*=*ēdos*, *sibun*=*septem*" (p. 133). In the treatment of nouns a few inaccuracies occur. *Brösameln* is not derived from *brechen* (p. 129), of which the Germanic root is *brek*, but is related either to the Germanic root *brut* (cf. ags. *brēotan*) or to the Celtic-Germanic root *brūs* (cf. Kluge); nor *Schwanz* from *schwanken*, but by means of the intensive formations *swangezen*, *swankzen* from *schwingen* (cf. Kluge). Middle High German *güete* and *schoene* (p. 141) are not originally of the *ō* but of the *i* declension; and there are difficulties in the way of showing that "vom konsonantischem Stamme kommt auch der zeitbestimmende Wesfall *Nachts*=mhd. *nahtes*" (p. 146). The O.H.G. genitive was *naht*, while the form *nahtes* was used only adverbially and was likely due to analogy.

Mistakes of fact, except in so far as some of the above may be so interpreted, are happily few in the book. It may be asked what is meant by "Für ihn [Otfried] war in erster Linie der Gedanke an seine Gemeinde massgebend" (p. 7). "Was der Deutsche zu thun pflegt, wird ihm zur Pflicht" (p. 51), is precisely hind side before, since *Pflicht* is the abstract noun to *pflegen* long before the verb is used with the meaning 'to be accustomed to.' It is by no means certain that "Mond von Haus aus den (Zeit-)Messer bezeichnet" (p. 88). *Dänemark* is apparently not 'Dänenwald' (p. 89), but simply 'Dänengrenze' (cf. Vigfússon and Kluge); nor is *Seeland* (p. 89) to be derived from an. *lundr* (not *lund* as cited by Professor Weise) but rather to be divided *Seel-* and and referred to the root *sal*. cf. Vigfússon). "Dass es Freude bereitet, das Vieh zur Weide zur führen, sagt das Wort *Wonne*='Weide'" (p. 90). *Wonne*, however, mhd. *wunne* (*wünne*), ahd. *wunna* (*wunni*) got. **wunja*, has in fact quite a different history from the first member of the compound *Wonnemonat* to which Professor Weise refers, for this is related through mhd. *wünne*, ahd. *wunnea* to got. *winja* 'pasturage,' 'fodder' (cf. Kluge). I question also whether in Luther's *wollen doch solcher Predigt nicht, ich kenne des Menschen nicht* we have the government of the genitive by the verb. It seems more likely that the genitive is partitive in the Middle High German fashion after *nicht*. I cannot find that in M.H.G. *wollen* or *kennen* govern the genitive. Franke (*Schriftsprache* Luthers, p. 239) finds that *wollen* governs in Luther the accusative; the only example of the genitive cited being the one given above; while *nicht* occurs for *nichts* (*ib.* p. 270).¹

A few minor errors remain to be corrected. English *clip* (p. 93, note 3) is Shaksperian, but not modern for 'embrace;' *dear* (p. 226, l. 27) should read *deer*; and *wafre* (p. 232, note),

¹ Grimm, *Wb.* s. v. *kennen* cites: "ich kenn dein nit, wann du hast mein nit bekant, dieweil du lebest"—Heiligenleben, 1472, 127a. Cf. *Gram.* iv, 652: "durch jenes die einfache negation begleitende *niowiht niht* werden fast alle ahd. und mhd. verneinenden sätze in bezug auf die partitive construction zweifelhaft." Kehrein, *Gram.*, gives no example of a genitive after *wollen*; and none without a negation after *kennen* (iii, 123).

wafer. I do not know what is meant by English *bill* (p. 102, l. 30) associated with German *Unbill* and *billig*, unless possibly an imaginary noun from A.S. *bilewit*. *Mhd* (p. 153, l. 10) is evidently a misprint for *nhd*.

It will be seen that the errors pointed out are not of great moment in themselves, and detract but little from the value of the work from the author's point of view. Adverse criticism is indeed based largely upon a difference of opinion as to method and manner. For a book of its kind *Unsere Muttersprache* is carefully and well written, and the scientific basis of it may be pronounced sufficient. Much useful material is here; the aptly introduced bibliography is especially full; and the treatment is stimulating. The book will not fill the want, still felt by so many learners of German, of a systematic and somewhat detailed history of the language, correlating the grammars of different periods, and explaining the peculiarities of modern German. But in its own sphere it may, after a proper caution, be commended to American students.

WILLIAM GUILD HOWARD.

Harvard University.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE ELIZABETHAN ATTITUDE TOWARDS INSANITY.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—The interesting thesis of Mr. Corbin's recent work on "The Elizabethan Hamlet," in regard to the conventionally comic aspects of insanity to the contemporaries of Shakspeare, might be enforced by many citations from the literature of the time other than those noticed by Mr. Corbin. In Percy's *Reliques* (ed. Wheatley, London, 1886, vol. ii, pp. 344 f.) there is a sheaf of old songs and ballads of madness. The intent of several of these is obviously comic. The mad-songs from Tom D'Urfey of a somewhat later date (1694), with their bathetical attempts at the sentimentally romantic, suggest that the serious acceptance of the pathos of insanity began early—of course it was existent with the Elizabethans alongside of the comic interpre-

tation, as Mr. Corbin points out—and that it rapidly grew to be the conventional point of view. There is a good deal of this sort of thing throughout the literature of the Eighteenth Century, where it plays a part worth noticing in the Romantic Reaction. Mr. Corbin has pointed out several of the mad-scenes in Elizabethan literature which are important material in the study of this topic. My observations include the following: Greene's *Orlando Furioso* (see especially in ed. Dyce, London, 1861, pp. 99 n., 100, 104-106—the effect striven for is very mixed, but the fantastically comic is obviously one of the elements); Marlowe's *First Part of Tamburlaine*, act v, scene ii (ed. Bullen, i, 97—where the effect to us moderns at least is bloody and sombre; indeed, Was Marlowe likely to design it otherwise?); Lyly (?), *The Woman in the Moon*, act v (ed. Fairholt, vol. ii, pp. 199 f.—this is a "piteous lunacy," but the intention is satiric); Webster, *The White Devil* (in the part of Cornelia, with its obvious reminiscences of Shakspeare), and the sufficiently noted dance of madmen in *The Duchess of Malfi* (commented upon by Mr. Corbin); Middleton's *Changeling* (similarly noted); Ford's *The Broken Heart*, iv, sc. ii (intention pathetic); Jonson, *The Alchemist*, act iv, sc. iii (a bit of feigned lunacy), and in *Bartholomew Fair*, the part of Trouble-all (a comic madman); Dekker's *First Part of the Honest Whore*, act v, sc. ii (note that the visitors to the madhouse first laugh at the "first madman's" ravings, but are rebuked for it—"Do you laugh at God's creatures?"—; then they comment, "A very piteous sight"); Shirley's *The Cardinal*, act v, sc. iii (feigned madness?—the treatment is serious); Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy* (Hazlitt's Dodsley, v, 56 f., 94 f., 106 f., 130 f.; cf. p. 164). Massinger's *A New Way to Pay Old Debts*, act v (Sir Giles Overreach); Fletcher's *The Pilgrim*, act iii, sc. vii, act iv, sc. iii, act v, sc. v (here we have the interior of a madhouse, which the Pilgrim is taken to see as one of the sights of the city. He is promised the view of fancies and gestures—

"Some of pity,
That it would make you melt to see their passions;
And some as light again, that would content you."

Fletcher's *The Noble Gentleman*, I, sc.iii, iii,

sc. ii, iv, sc. iii, v, sc. i (in the part of Chatilion, "a gentleman mad for love"); Fletcher's *The Nice Valor*, or *The Passionate Madman*, passim; and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, iii, sc. iv, v, sc. i, iii, v, sc. ii (the Jailor's daughter running mad for love of Palamon is welcomed by the morris-dancers as one who will make their fortunes. She joins their dance before the Duke. The pathos of her state is accentuated, though somewhat bizarrely). See also Campion's *The Lords' Masque* (ed. Bullen, pp. 192 f.—*Mania*, the goddess of Madness, the dance of the *Twelve Frantics*, etc.). Outside of the drama an interesting burlesque treatment of insanity is to be found in Anthony Scoloker's (?) *Daiphantus, or The Passions of Love, Comical to read, But Tragical to Act*, London, 1604 (reprinted in Arber's *English Garner*, vol. vii pp. 379 f.). In the mock-dedication the author pretends that such a poem as his ought to be

"like friendly *Shake-speare's* Tragedies, where the Comedian rides, when the Tragedian stands on tiptoe. Faith, it should please all, like Prince *Hamlet*! But, in sadness, then it were to be feared, he would run mad. In sooth, I will not be moonsick, to please! nor out of my wits, though I displease all!"

See also pp. 408-9, where Daiphantus runs mad for love.

"TASSO he finds, by that of HAMLET thinks,
Terms him a madman, then of his ink horn drinks!"
.... "Puts off his clothes! his shirt he only wears!
Much like mad HAMLET, thus, as Passion tears!"

The satirical intent here is obvious. But did the audience of Shakspeare's *Hamlet* find cause for merriment in the supposed madness of the part? Did Hamlet, in order to give the groundlings a fit of mirth and thus "please all," "run mad"?

FREDERIC IVES CARPENTER.
The University of Chicago.

GROOVY.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—Professor Brander Matthews calls attention in your issue of December, 1895, to the words *groovy* and *grooviness*, which he ranks as Briticisms; but I am sure that many of us have suffered the dint of these words afar from British soil. A particularly delicious

use of *groovy* occurs repeatedly in a college catalog, so-called, published in 1892 by Cecilian College, Cecilian P.O., Hardin Co., Kentucky. I do not, of course, assert that *groovy* can be found in any reputable American magazine; the words quoted below are those of the "Cecilian" school-master, who was born and bred in Kentucky.

"If teachers want to know how to do all this, instead of smelling along after the books, let them come to Cecilian, and learn to leave off their old granny methods and *groovy* ways, and come to the front."

E. H. LEWIS.

University of Chicago.

A CORRECTION.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—In Prof. Henneman's otherwise accurate account of the paper read by me at the Yale meeting, there is one slip which I must hasten to correct.

It is to be found in your issue of February, column 69, about two thirds down the column, and reads thus:

"The sense-power of most persons is obtuse. This obtuseness is Anglo-American, generally, but it is essentially American; there is an impatience at etiquette and at all form, and one personally resents correction as one would a slur."

This makes me say something unpleasantly like nonsense. Why should I assert that "the sense-power of most persons is obtuse"? What I did assert was:

1. That the *sense of form* is not acute in the Anglo-American race in general;
2. That this obtuseness is aggravated in the American race by the spirit of democracy;
3. That this obtuseness manifests itself, in our writing, as an impatience of correction. Our young men resent correction, as if it were a slur, an infringement upon their right to say what they please as they please.

J. M. HART.

Cornell University.

WRITTEN TRANSLATION OF FRENCH AND GERMAN IN TEACHING ENGLISH COMPOSITION.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—In common with others who had the

pleasure of listening to President Hart's address before the Modern Language Association at its recent meeting in New Haven, I was much interested by his able presentation of the question now receiving general attention; namely, the remedy for the unsatisfactory work of secondary schools in preparatory English. While I am not qualified to speak as a teacher in secondary schools, I have had some experience with the product of those institutions, conditioned college students.

English, French and German are almost invariably neglected for what the schools seem to think the determining qualifications for admission: Greek, Latin and Mathematics; or Natural Sciences and Mathematics, as the case may be. Three-fifths of the students conditioned in German or French are conditioned in English as well, and I believe that in the proper study of the "Modern Languages" lies the remedy for defective English. If a teacher beginning work with a student conditioned in German, for example, will make it his first business to ascertain how much English the boy knows, he will often find that he has failed in translation largely because he is unable to use his own language.

The best remedy for this condition of things I have found to be written translation of narrative prose. The work must be done as carefully with respect to writing good English prose as to making a faithful translation. The logical relation of clauses, the emphatic position of words and phrases in the two languages must be understood, and accurate punctuation must be insisted upon. For how can a beginner render an involved German sentence without a careful observance of the various marks, both in the original and in his translation? This work may be made of incalculable value in the discrimination of synonyms. Especially is the student taught the correct use of adjectives, usually his weakest point. These things cannot be accurately observed and corrected except in a written exercise, and hence a part of the work should be presented in this form.

The importance of oral translation and of sight-reading are not forgotten. After a few weeks' practice in written translation a decided improvement appears, and more than

once a student has been able to pass his English examination in consequence of the work done in making up a German condition.

I believe, then, that the preparatory schools should be urged to include in their curricula written translation, from German or French, and made to understand that no translation, however good literally, will be accepted for admission that is not given in correct English. For this purpose translation from French or German is better than from the Classics, because printed versions are not so accessible or so likely to be used, and because the subject-matter is more easily rendered into idiomatic English. This plan has advantages for certain purposes even over original English composition. The student is not troubled with invention, and he has not recourse to books for proper modes of expression. The average school composition is a potpourri of descriptive phrases culled from every available source. This evil the extempore composition in vogue at some schools effectually checks. What is the first work done in prose composition by the English-speaking student of a foreign language? Translation of English narrative prose. Why, then, is not translation of French or German narrative prose advantageous to an English-speaking student defective in his own language?

The adoption of such a plan as I have outlined means more work for the Modern-Language teachers in secondary schools, perhaps an addition to the teaching force in some cases. It also means that the teachers of French and German in those schools must be *masters of English*, and hence quite differently qualified from the average "native teacher" found there. To the proprietors of some schools it might not be a welcome change, for it would mean higher salaries for the department heretofore the least expensive on the pay-roll. To the colleges it would be a most decided benefit, and it is their right to demand that the schools shall do thoroughly what their year-books promise.

WM. ADDISON HERVEY.

Columbia College, N. Y.

BRIEF MENTION.

A new edition, the fifth in order, of Hettner's

Die französische Literatur im achtzehnten Jahrhundert has been recently prepared for the press by Heinrich Morf (Braunschweig: Druck und Verlag von Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, 1894, 8vo, pp. xi, 601). In the fourteen years that had passed since the author's last revision considerable new material had accumulated, which Morf has endeavored to incorporate in the original text. Naturally some of this recent work would modify to a considerable extent the judgments formed by Hettner, as well as alter their relative importance. But the reviser has aimed at as little change as possible, contenting himself with adding minor details and with giving certain writers, notably La Mettrie and Grimm, a larger place in the narrative. Comments on these additions are superfluous. They are in no way inferior to the matter they supplement. If we might offer a criticism anywhere it is in regard to the make-up of the book, a criticism which would probably not appeal to German authors and publishers. The matter inserted by Morf amounts in extent to about one ninth of the original volume. In order not sensibly to increase its bulk, the editor has compressed his lines and changed his type, so that a page contains at least two lines more than the edition we have at hand (the second), and the line is made to hold one additional word of moderate length. The result is that more effort must be spent on the mere reading of the book; and for foreigners, whose daily practise is with Roman characters, this combination of crowded lines with German letters amounts to a measurable physical fatigue. Possibly the substitution of Roman for German type might not help matters here, should the limited pagination be adhered to, but in general it is to be regretted that all works on science and foreign literature published in Germany are not printed in that type which is the more widely used.